

DEC 17 1948

VOLUME XLIII

NUMBER 4

October 1948

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

---

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*  
JOHN PHILIP COOKE, *Assistant Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
RICHARD TREAT BRUERE

CARL DARLING BUCK  
PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY  
BENEDICT EINARSON  
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

RICHARD P. McKEON  
RALPH MARCUS  
GERTRUDE SMITH

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, *University of California*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*  
BEN EDWIN PERRY, *University of Illinois*

RODNEY POTTER ROBINSON, *University of Cincinnati*  
DOM ANSELM STRITTMATTER, *St. Anselm's Priory*  
LILY ROSS TAYLOR, *Bryn Mawr College*

VOL. XLIII CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1948 No. 4

Boccaccio and the Cassinese Manuscripts of the Laurentian Library . . . . .	Cornelia C. Coulter	217
A Labor Contract of A.D. 164: <i>CIL</i> , III, p. 948, No. X . . . . .	Adolf Berger	231
On the Nominal Endings -is, -iv, in Later Greek . . . . .	Demetrius John Georgacas	243
Notes and Discussions . . . . .		261
F. P. JOHNSON: Who Built the Wall of Rome?		
Book Reviews . . . . .		265
<p>ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT: <i>Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars</i> (Kantorowicz).—ETTORE BIGNONE: <i>Storia della letteratura latina</i> (Pease).—ALLEN WIKGREN et al.: <i>Hellenistic Greek Texts</i> (Rife).—<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>, No. 3 (Keck).—S. A. HANDFORD: <i>The Latin Subjunctive</i> (Whatmough).—JOHN S. CREAGHAN and A. E. RAUBITSCHKE: <i>Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens</i> (Willoughby).—KRISTER HANELL: <i>Das altrömische eponyme Amt</i> (Boak).—C. E. VAN SICKLE: <i>A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World, Vol. I: The Orient and Greece to the Partition of the Empire of Alexander the Great</i> (Start).—ROLAND G. KENT: <i>The Forms of Latin</i> (Whatmough).—<i>Aegyptus</i>, Vol. XXV (1945) (Welles).—JEAN HUBAUX: <i>Les grands mythes de Rome</i> (Krappe).—J. A. MOORE: <i>Selections from the Greek Elegiac, Iambic, and Lyric Poets</i> (Latimore).—ANDRÉ LAMBERT: <i>Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius</i> (Laistner).—RAYMOND BLOCH: <i>Les Origines de Rome</i> (Whatmough).—MARTIN NINCK: <i>Die Entdeckung von Europa durch die Griechen</i> (Diller).—MARVIN T. HERRICK: <i>The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1565</i> (Tracy).—J. C. ARENS: <i>De Godenschilpering in Ovidius' Metamorphosen</i> (Krappe).—J. VAN OOTEGHEM: <i>Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina</i>, 2d ed., rev. and enl. (Krappe).</p>		
Books Received . . . . .		281
Index to Volume XLIII . . . . .		283

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$6.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$6.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.79); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$6.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.85). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire, except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box 117, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

7

ais

4

7

1

3

1

5

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

C

*Vol*

S

Tac  
"Me  
adv  
has  
man  
of I  
mis  
tak  
sen  
by  
to a  
sion  
lon  
itse  
of  
Nic  
Sar  
fro  
the

wi  
sor  
the  
M  
wi  
sta  
m  
wi

VI

(C

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLIII

OCTOBER 1948

Number 4

## BOCCACCIO AND THE CASSINESE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE LAURENTIAN LIBRARY

CORNELIA C. COULTER

SINCE the publication in 1902 by Enrico Rostagno of a facsimile of the eleventh-century manuscript of Tacitus in the Laurentian Library called "Mediceus II" (Laur. 68.2), the theory advanced in the Preface to this volume has been generally accepted: that the manuscript was removed from the library of Monte Cassino, with or without permission, by Giovanni Boccaccio and was taken by him to Florence, where its presence is attested after Boccaccio's death by references in Poggio's correspondence to a manuscript of Tacitus in the possession of Niccolò Niccoli, written "litteris longobardis"; by a note in the manuscript itself, stating that it came to the convent of San Marco "de hereditate Nicolai Nicoli"; and by records of the library of San Marco and the Laurentian Library from the end of the fifteenth century to the present time.<sup>1</sup>

In discussing Boccaccio's connection with the manuscript, Rostagno's successors have voiced more clearly than he did the suspicion that it was stolen from Monte Cassino; and they have coupled with a statement about this codex similar statements about the eleventh-century manuscript of Apuleius (called "F") which is bound with the Tacitus and the

copy of Varro's *De lingua Latina* now in the Laurentian Library (51.10), or have made a general pronouncement about "the Beneventan classics of the Laurentian" as forming "one group."<sup>2</sup> The group in question would presumably include (in addition to the three manuscripts just mentioned): a second manuscript of Apuleius (Laur. 29.2, called  $\phi$ , a thirteenth-century copy of F), one copy each of Hegesippus (66.1) and Justinus (66.21), and perhaps one of Caesar (68.6).<sup>3</sup>

In reviewing these statements not long ago, I became convinced that the whole

<sup>2</sup> R. Sabbadini, *Le Scoperte dei codici latini e greci nei secoli XIV e XV*, I (Firenze, 1905), 29-31 and 213; II (Firenze, 1914), 202 and 254 and 258; E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914), pp. 70-71; and "The Unique Manuscript of Tacitus' *Historiae*," in *Casinensis* (Montecassino, 1929), I, 265-66. The Tacitus and the Apuleius are now bound together, with the Tacitus preceding; but the numbering of the quaternions indicates that at an earlier period the Apuleius came first. A generation ago, scholars believed that this manuscript of Tacitus was to be identified with the "Historiam Cornelii cum Omero" listed among the manuscripts copied under the Abbot Desiderius (1058-87); but Lowe ("The Unique Manuscript of Tacitus' *Historiae*," pp. 260-63) has now established the date of both the Tacitus and the Apuleius as pre-Desiderian and has presented evidence to show that the title "Historiam Cornelii" probably applied, not to the works of Tacitus, but to the story of the fall of Troy supposedly written by Dares Phrygius and translated into Latin by Cornelius Nepos.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, pp. 70-71 and 339; and below, p. 228. Lowe also lists among the Beneventan manuscripts of the Laurentian Library a volume (66.40) containing *Ezordia Scythica*, *Dares Phrygius De excidio Troiae*, and the *Historia Apollonis regis Tyri*.

<sup>1</sup> *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti*, VII, Part II (Lugdunum Batavorum, 1902), I-viii.

question deserved re-examination in the light of what we now know of Boccaccio's life and the history of his library. The results of this re-examination are presented here.<sup>4</sup> They seem to show that the evidence for the removal by Boccaccio of manuscripts from Monte Cassino is much less strong than has generally been supposed and that the person actually responsible for the removal of these manuscripts may have been a man of far greater importance than he in the history of fourteenth-century Italy.

Any consideration of Boccaccio's connection with Cassinese manuscripts must include the story of a visit to Monte Cassino, related, on the authority of Boccaccio himself, by Benvenuto da Imola, in his commentary on the *Divine Comedy*.<sup>5</sup> The story is introduced at the point in the *Paradiso* (Canto XXII, ll. 73-78) where St. Benedict, after speaking of the stairway to heaven on which the patriarch Jacob saw the angels, says:

Ma, per salirla, mo nessun diparte  
da terra i piedi, e la regola mia  
rimasa è per danno delle carte.

Le mura che soleano esser badia,  
fatte sono spelonche, e le cocolle  
sacca son piene di farina ria.

Benvenuto interprets the phrase "Ma nessun diparte mo i piedi da terra" and adds:

Sed nota quod autor videtur nimis large loqui hic, quia adhuc sunt multi monachi sub habitu et regula Benedicti satis sancte viventes, quantum apparet, sicut ego vidi in aliquibus locis, sicut in fratribus montis Oliveti.

<sup>4</sup> This article is connected with a longer study of Boccaccio's knowledge of the classics, which I hope to complete in the near future. It seems advisable to publish this material separately, in order to discuss some points in more detail than is possible in the projected work.

<sup>5</sup> Benvenuto de Rambaldis de Imola. *Comentum super Dantis Aldigherij Comoediam*, ed. W. Warren Vernon (Firenze, 1887), V, 301-2. I quote the text of Dante from Vandelli's revision of Scartazzini's edition (Milan, 1921). The lemma of Benvenuto's commentary on the third line reads: *rimasa è giù*.

He then gives it as his opinion that what Benedict says refers only to Cassinum, "de quo autor specialiter hic loquitur, et qui de rei veritate est valde desertus et desolatus, ut statim dicitur." Then, after interpreting "la regola mia rimasa è giù per danno delle carte," he continues:

Et volo hic ad clariorem intelligentiam huius literæ referre illud quod narrabat mihi jocose venerabilis præceptor meus Boccaccius de Certaldo. Dicebat enim quod dum esset in Apulia, captus fama loci, accessit ad nobile monasterium montis Cassini, de quo dictum est. Et avidus videndi librariam, quam audiverat ibi esse nobilissimam, petivit ab uno monacho humiliter, velut ille qui suavissimus erat, quod deberet ex gratia aperire sibi bibliothecam. At ille rigide respondit, ostendens sibi altam scalam: ascende quia aperta est. Ille laetus ascendens invenit locum tanti thesauri sine ostio vel clavi, ingressusque vidit herbam natam per fenestras, et libros omnes cum bancis coopertis pulvere alto; et mirabundus coepit aperire et volvere nunc istum librum, nunc illum, invenitque ibi multa et varia volumina antiquorum et peregrinorum librorum; ex quorum aliquibus detracti erant aliqui quaterni, ex aliis recisi margines chartarum, et sic multipliciter deformati: tandem miseratus labores et studia tot inclytissimorum ingeniorum devenisse ad manus perditissimorum hominum, dolens et illacrymans recessit; et occurrens in claustro petivit a monacho obvio quare libri illi pretiosissimi essent ita turpiter detruncati. Qui respondit quod aliqui monachi, volentes lucrari duos vel quinque solidos, radebant unum quaternum et faciebant psalteriolos, quos vendebant pueris; et ita de marginibus faciebant evangelia et breviam, quæ vendebant mulieribus. Nunc, vir studiose, frange tibi caput pro faciendo libros.<sup>6</sup>

Since Benvenuto attended Boccaccio's lectures on Dante in Florence in the

<sup>6</sup> The word *jocose* in Benvenuto's introductory sentence must connote not lighthearted jest but the bitter amusement of one who, when he contemplates the labor of bookmaking, reflects, with the "preacher" of the Book of Ecclesiastes: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

autumn and winter of 1373-74, it seems reasonable to assume that he heard the story from his "venerable teacher" during this period.<sup>7</sup> Boccaccio's desire to visit the ancient abbey, with its famous collection of manuscripts, is in line with what we know of his interest in books throughout his mature years; and he would have been all the more eager to see it if tales had reached his ears such as are recorded by Giovanni Cavallini in a commentary on Valerius Maximus written between 1320 and 1350: that there was at Monte Cassino a manuscript of Livy, "De bello Punico primo" (i.e., the second decade), and also the six books of Cicero's *De re publica*.<sup>8</sup> The picture of the neglected library, with grass growing on the windowsills and bookshelves covered with dust, and of precious volumes mutilated by monks intent on gaining a few soldi is perhaps not surprising in the period when Monte Cassino was ruled by bishop-abbots, many of whom were unfamiliar with monastic discipline (1321-67). If the visit had occurred soon after the disastrous earthquake of September 9, 1349, we should expect some allusion to the ruined state of the abbey; the fact that this is not mentioned would seem to place the incident either before this date or after a certain amount of rebuilding had been done by the Abbot Angelo della Posta (1357-62). The general tone of the narrative suggests reminiscence and reflection over an event long past; but there is no actual clue to the date beyond the clause *dum esset in Apulia*.

The word *Apulia* is used by Latin writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for the southern Italian domains of Robert of Anjou and his heirs;<sup>9</sup> so the clause, *dum esset in Apulia*, might apply to any one of Boccaccio's stays in the Neapolitan kingdom. We know that he first came to Naples from Florence in the autumn of 1328 with his father, who was a *socius* of the great banking firm of the Bardi, and that he made his home there until the close of 1340, when he was recalled to Florence by his father after the failure of the firm. In January, 1348, when he was in Forlì as the guest of Francesco degli Ordellaffi, Boccaccio wrote that he was planning to accompany his host on an expedition to the south, where Francesco expected to support Louis of Hungary in his attempt to avenge the murder of his brother Andrew, first husband of Queen Joanna of Naples. Boccaccio may have been with Louis of Hungary when Louis of Tarentum, second husband of the queen, faced him with an army north of Capua; and he almost certainly was in Naples for a brief stay in the early part of 1348, after the flight of Joanna and Louis of Tarentum to Provence. He went to Naples again in October or November, 1362, on the invitation of a fellow-Florentine and friend of former years, Niccolò Acciaiuoli, but left for the north again about March, 1363, in high dudgeon over what he considered outrageous treatment by Niccolò and his household. He was in Naples again for a short time in the winter

<sup>7</sup> G. F. Lacaïta, in the account of Benvenuto's life and works prefixed to Warren Vernon's edition (p. xxv), suggests that Benvenuto may have met Boccaccio at Avignon, whither both men were sent as ambassadors to Pope Urban V in 1365; but it is doubtful whether their stays overlapped. On the two sets of dates see F. Novati's review of L. Rossi-Casé, in *Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, XVII (1891), 92-95; and E. Hutton, *Giovanni Boccaccio* (London, 1910), pp. 209-12.

<sup>8</sup> Sabbadini, *op. cit.*, II, 47-49.

<sup>9</sup> E.g., in the title of Matteo Palmieri's *De vita et gestis Nicolai Acciaiuoli Florentini magni Apuliae senescalli*, and throughout this work; similarly, the Italian *Puglia*, in Giovanni Villani's *Croniche*, IX, 325, and elsewhere. The northern boundary of the kingdom is indicated by a sentence in Boccaccio's letter of 1363, describing his journey from Naples to Venice, in which, after mentioning a day's visit with Barbato at Sulmona, he says: "di quindi partito, dopo il secondo di uscì del regno" (*Epist. 12 in Opere latine minori*, ed. F. Massera [Bari, 1923], p. 174, from which edition all citations of Boccaccio's letters in this article are taken).

of 1370-71, and possibly again the following winter.<sup>10</sup>

For a tourist of the present day, an excursion of about seventy miles by rail or motorcar from Naples to Monte Cassino presents no great difficulty; but such an expedition was not to be undertaken lightly by a traveler on foot or on horseback in the fourteenth century. It would, on the other hand, have been fairly simple for Boccaccio to make a side trip to the abbey on his way to or from Naples if he followed the route via Capua, Venafrò, Isernia, and Sulmona, which is hinted for the journey of 1340 and is definitely recorded for the spring of 1363.<sup>11</sup> But neither

the year 1340, when Boccaccio had been recalled to Florence because of his father's poverty and was bowed down by his personal grief, nor 1363, when he was in wretched physical condition and was smarting under the indignities that he had suffered in Naples, seems a likely time for such a visit.

The most probable times for Boccaccio's visit to Monte Cassino would therefore seem to be the early part of 1348, when he may have been in the country north of Capua and was almost certainly in Naples; the autumn of 1362, when he journeyed south to visit Niccolò Acciaiuoli; and the winter of 1370-71. In some ways it would seem most natural to date the expedition in 1348, when Boccaccio was young and vigorous, free from anxieties and responsibilities, and in comparatively affluent circumstances. On the other hand, the one reference that he makes to the library of Monte Cassino, in a poetic epistle written near the end of 1355 or the beginning of 1356, might be interpreted to mean that at this period (which, it should be remembered, falls between the earthquake and the rebuilding of the monastery) he still knew the "beautiful cloisters" and the books of Monte Cassino only by reputation. Boccaccio writes to Zanobi di Strada, who had recently received the laurel crown at Pisa from the Emperor Charles IV and who was now in the Neapolitan area as secretary to the king, urging him to fresh literary activity, with the words:

Fac, age, tange chelim; contemnunt otia  
frondes  
peneide, damnatque cohors veneranda sororum  
Castalidum. Nos turba minor suspensa tene-  
mus

reflects Boccaccio's own itinerary in 1340 (cf. V. Crescini, *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio* [Torino, 1887], pp. 70-85). Boccaccio (*Epist.* 12, p. 174) mentions stops at Aversa and Sulmona in the spring of 1363.

<sup>10</sup> On the date of Boccaccio's first arrival in Naples see H. Hauvette, *Boccaccio* (Paris, 1914), pp. 26-27; C. C. Coulter, "A Supplementary Note on the Road to Alagna," *Phil. Quart.*, XX (1941), 600-602. The evidence for his return in 1340 is summarized by Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60. I have left out of consideration the possibility that Boccaccio may have gone to Capua in November, 1339, and November, 1340, to collect the revenues from the *podere* of San Lorenzo (see A. Della Torre, *La Giovinezza di G. Boccaccio* [Città di Castello, 1905], pp. 309-12). Even if Boccaccio made the collection in person (which is uncertain), he probably would not have traveled forty miles farther north to see the library; and the same psychological argument holds against a visit at either of these times as against a stop on the northbound journey at the end of 1340. For the expedition to the south in 1348 and the subsequent stay in Naples see Boccaccio, *Epist.* 6, p. 128, and *Eclogue* 14, 51-53; Hauvette, "Sulla cronologia delle Egloghe latine del Boccaccio," in *Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, XXVIII (1896), 167-69, and *Boccaccio*, pp. 178-93. For the visit of 1362-63 see Boccaccio, *Epist.* 12; Petrarch, *Epist. sen.*, III, 1; J. B. Ross, "On the Early History of Leontius' Translation of Homer," *Class. Phil.*, XXII (1927), 341, n. 4. For the visit of 1370-71 see Boccaccio, *Epist.* 15, and Hauvette, *Boccaccio*, pp. 444-46. The date of his return from this visit is uncertain. F. Torraca (*Per la biografia di Giovanni Boccaccio* [Milano, 1912], pp. 197-203), argues for two visits to Naples at this period, one in 1370-71, the other in 1371-72; and Massera accepts this theory with a question mark in his dating of *Epist.* 16. G. Minozzi (*Montecassino nella storia del Rinascimento* [Roma, 1925], I, 23-33) discusses the dates of Boccaccio's stays in Naples and decides on the autumn of 1362 as the most probable time for the visit to Monte Cassino. His dating of Boccaccio's first arrival in Naples in 1323, rather than in 1328, does not affect the argument. In his discussion of other points he fails to include some of the evidence now available.

<sup>11</sup> The route followed by Fileno in *Filocolo*, ed. S. Battaglia (Bari, 1938), Book III, p. 226, probably

ora quidem, si forte cadat de fonte propinquo  
quid sapidum, aut cupidus nobis quod mulceat  
aures.

Quid, breviter videant homines. Tu denique  
prudens  
multa vides, et pulcra sedens nunc cernere  
debēs  
librorum in medio quos servant claustra  
Cassini.<sup>12</sup>

The autumn of 1362 and the winter of 1370-71 are in themselves possible times for the visit; but no one of the three dates offers an entirely satisfactory solution of Boccaccio's connection with the Cassinese manuscripts of classical authors in the Laurentian Library. Since the original discussion centered about the manuscript of Tacitus, it may be well to begin with that.

Boccaccio was certainly not acquainted with Tacitus when he wrote the *De casibus virorum illustrium* (probably between 1355 and 1360) or the original version of the *De claris mulieribus* (dedicated to Andrea, sister of Niccolò Acciaiuoli and countess of Altavilla, in 1362); but he made extensive use of Books xii-xvi of the *Annals* and Books ii-iii of the *Histories* in a later version of the *De claris mulieribus*, in marginal notes added to his autograph copy of the *De genealogia deorum* (certainly after the autumn of 1363, and probably after November, 1366), and in the lectures on Dante (begun in October, 1373). The fact that Petrarch's writings reveal no knowledge of Tacitus' works probably indicates that Boccaccio first became acquainted with Tacitus not long before Petrarch's death in the summer of 1374.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Carm. V, in *Opere latine minori*, II, 51-58. Zanobi had originally gone to Naples in 1349 with Angelo Acciaiuoli, bishop of Florence (see p. 226, below). For Boccaccio's circumstances in 1348 see *Epist.* 6, p. 128, where he says that he is to accompany Ordelaffi, "non armiger sed ut ita loquar rerum occurrentium arbitri." For further details in this letter see p. 225, below.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. P. de Nolhac, "Boccace et Tacite," *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist.*, XII (1892), 125-48. It would seem most natural to date Boccaccio's acquaintance with Tacitus after his visit to Petrarch's home in Venice in

A letter written by Boccaccio from Naples in January, 1371, to Niccolò da Montefalcone, abbot of the convent of Santo Stefano, in Calabria, furnishes definite proof that at this time Boccaccio had a manuscript of Tacitus in his possession. The abbot had given Boccaccio a cordial invitation to visit him at Santo Stefano, painting an alluring picture of the charms of the place, and Boccaccio had been expecting to set out with him, when suddenly, without giving any hint of his plans or saying a word of farewell, the abbot took ship for Calabria, leaving Boccaccio behind in Naples. Boccaccio's letter sets forth in some detail the discourtesy of this conduct, and closes with the words:

Quaternum quem asportasti Cornelii Taciti  
queso saltem mittas, ne laborem meum frus-  
traveris et libro deformitatem ampliorem  
addideris.<sup>14</sup>

The codex of Tacitus from which the abbot had borrowed a quaternion was certainly either Mediceus II, containing *Annals* xi-xvi and *Histories* i-v, or a copy of this manuscript; for the sections of Tacitus' works that Boccaccio quotes or paraphrases are the sections found in Mediceus II, and only these.<sup>15</sup>

1367 and the letter telling of this visit (*Epist.* 14, "Scripta Florentie primo kalendas Iulii"); but, of course, one should not give too much weight to the *argumentum ex silentio*. On the date of the marginal additions in the manuscript of the *De genealogia deorum*, see O. Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde* (Braunschweig, 1902), pp. 108-11. The name of Tacitus also appears in the revised version of *Amor. vis.*, V, 64-66, in which Boccaccio sees "Tacito e Orosio stare ed altri assai, de' qual pochi eran ch' i' non conoscesse." In his critical edition of the poem (Firenze [1944]), p. lxxix, V. Branca dates this revision in 1352 or later; and on pp. ciii-iv he argues that Boccaccio's acquaintance with Tacitus began with a visit to Monte Cassino in 1362.

<sup>14</sup> *Epist.* 15, p. 185. The words *laborem meum*, as De Nolhac noted, suggest a copy made by Boccaccio rather than the original manuscript.

<sup>15</sup> The word *deformitas* is appropriate; for Mediceus II, although not itself mutilated at these points, begins and ends its text of the *Annals* with a fragmentary sentence and breaks off in Book v of the *Histories* in the midst of a speech. The loss of two folia contain-

There is evidence that Boccaccio made a copy of the text of Mediceus II. A volume containing Tacitus was among the books bequeathed by Boccaccio to Fra Martino of the convent of Santo Spirito in Florence and was included in the inventory of the Parva Libreria of the convent in 1451; but it is certain that this began with the words: "Id quod de Cornelio Tacito reperitur." Mediceus II does not begin with these words—in fact, it has no heading at all; and "Id quod de Cornelio Tacito reperitur" might very well have been a descriptive title supplied by Boccaccio for the copy that he himself made. And, whereas Mediceus II is bound with Apuleius, the manuscript of the Parva Libreria was bound with Vitruvius, having at the close of the penultimate folio the words *machina accessura erat*, found in *De architectura* x. 16. 7.<sup>16</sup>

It would seem, therefore, that at some time between 1362 and 1371 Boccaccio had access to Mediceus II of Tacitus; that he had this manuscript in his hands long enough to make a copy of the text; and that he also made, either from the original manuscript or from his own copy, a full set of notes, which he used in his Latin works and in the lectures on Dante. If we assume that he stole Mediceus II from Monte Cassino, the autumn or early winter of 1370 is the most probable time for the theft; but it is hard to imagine a fifty-seven-year-old man, who was already painfully conscious of his age,<sup>17</sup> as

making off, unobserved, with anything so bulky as this particular codex, with its huge folio leaves and its heavy board covers.

Moreover, the later history of Mediceus II presents difficulties. This manuscript was at one time in the possession of Niccolò Niccoli and passed from his estate to the library of San Marco. Rostagno assumes that both Mediceus II and the copy made by Boccaccio were in the collection bequeathed to Fra Martino, and he surmises that, after Fra Martino's death, when the books of the collection were not carefully guarded, Niccolò availed himself of the opportunity to add a treasure to his library.<sup>18</sup> But, so far as we know, it was not Boccaccio's practice to make a second copy for his own use of a classical text that he already owned;<sup>19</sup> and the supposed theft seems hardly consistent with Niccolò's attitude toward Boccaccio and Boccaccio's books, as it is described

profectior atque nimis sagina corpus invalidum"; and also *Epist.* 17 (1372), p. 190, "anni, ut reor, supersunt pauci"; and *Epist.* 18 (1372), p. 192, "pedibus . . . vix ire possum, mole gravatus corporea."

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. vi. Rostagno quotes Poggio, *Epist.* III, 14, dated "V. kal. Octob. 1427": "Cornellum Tacitum, cum venerit, observabo penes me occulte. Scio enim omnem illam cantilenam, et unde exierit et per quem, et quis eum sibi vendicet; sed nil dubites, non exibat a me ne verbo quidem." A propos of the supposed theft, Rostagno says: "qui vero pependerit Poggii verba, . . . haud ita procul a vero aberrare videbitur si idem Tacitum Nicolai e Boccacii bybliotheca e ductum esse conciet, cum praesertim constet libros Boccacii . . . post obitum Fratr. Martini (a. 1387) diu clausos ac paene conditos Nicolaum de Niccolis e capsis et armariis deprompsisse eosque in bybliotheca Conventus Sancti Spiritus descriptos disposuisse: quo tempore nimirum fieri potuit ut Nicolaus, opportunitatem praestantissimo codice bybliothecam suam augendi adeptus, Taciti codicem antiquitate insignem clam auferret."

<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, there is considerable evidence of his copying texts that he did not own. *Epist.* 9, p. 136, tells how, during a visit at Petrarch's home in Padua, he spent the daylight hours in copying works of Petrarch that he was eager to have; and Laur. 29.8 and 33.31 preserve copies that he made for his own use of poems of Petrarch and other contemporaries, letters of Dante, the first Catilinarian oration of Cicero, the satires of Persius, etc.

ing parts of Books I and II of the *Historiae* probably occurred after Boccaccio's day.

<sup>16</sup> A. Goldmann, "Drei italienische Handschriften-kataloge s. xiii-xv," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, IV (1887), 137-55. The Tacitus is Item V.7. For the identification of the explicit of the penultimate folio see Hecker, *op. cit.*, pp. 318-19, note on the last paragraph of p. 40. On the heading of the manuscript in the Parva Libreria cf. Sabbadini, *op. cit.*, I, 30. The Livy of the Parva Libreria (Item VI.3) opened with a brief account of Livy's life, compiled by Boccaccio.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Epist.* 12 (1363), p. 150, "me vecchio"; *Epist.* 14 (1367), p. 180, "canum caput meum et etas

by Vespasiano da Bisticci in his *Vite di uomini illustri*.<sup>20</sup>

Vespasiano writes of the "libreria" still to be seen in his own day in the convent of Santo Spirito, "che si chiama del Boccaccio, la quale è di là dalla libreria de' frati, che la fece fare Nicolao Nicoli, e fecevi mettere i libri del Boccaccio, acciochè non si perdessino." And in another passage he describes more fully Niccolò's purpose in building this room:

E non bastò a Nicolao a volere che i sua libri fussino comuni, e stessino in luogo publico; che, sendo morto messer Giovanni Boccacci, e avendo lasciati tutti i sua libri a Santo Spirito, sendo posti in casse e armari, parve a Nicolao ch'egli stessino bene in una libreria che fusse publica a ognuno; e per questo delle sua sustanze fece fabricare una libreria, a fine che così potessino mettere i detti libri, sì per la loro conservazione, il simile ancora per onore di messer Giovanni, e a fine che fussino comuni a chi n'avesse di bisogno.

It is hard to believe that a man who felt so much reverence for Messer Giovanni Boccaccio would deliberately carry off one of the very books whose preservation he was trying to secure; and I am inclined to set over against Rostagno's theory the alternative hypothesis that the only copy of Tacitus bequeathed to Fra Martino was the one described in the inventory of 1451 and that Niccolò Niccoli obtained from some other source the manuscript which after his death passed to the convent of San Marco and eventually received the number 68.2 in the Laurentian Library.

When we consider the other Cassinese manuscripts in the Laurentian Library, the problem grows even more complicated. Boccaccio's acquaintance with the authors represented in these manuscripts falls, not, like his acquaintance with Tacitus, at the end of his life, but twenty-

five, thirty, or thirty-five years earlier, so that it is impossible to assume a single visit to Monte Cassino, from which he departed bearing half-a-dozen codices; and, on the other hand, a theory of repeated visits, with repeated depredations, seems hardly tenable.

Boccaccio had certainly read the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius before he left Naples in 1340,<sup>21</sup> and he must have had at hand a manuscript of at least portions of this work when he retold stories from the ninth book of the *Metamorphoses* in Novella 10 of the fifth day and Novella 2 of the seventh day of the *Decameron* (published in 1353). The *De genealogia deorum* presents a number of items from Apuleius,<sup>22</sup> which, unlike the material from Tacitus, appear in the main body of the text of Boccaccio's autograph manuscript, showing that they were incorporated in the work at least as early as 1363.

A copy of Apuleius is listed as Item VI.2 in the inventory of the Parva Libreria, and this manuscript is still in existence in the Laurentian Library, with the number 54.32. The manuscript was written by Boccaccio himself, in a hand that can be dated about 1350.<sup>23</sup> The text of Boccaccio's manuscript of Apuleius agrees in general with that of Laur. 29.2 (φ) but seems to represent a slightly different tradition, since, in addition to the *Apologia*, *Metamorphoses*, and *Florida*, found in F and φ, it also contains the *De deo Socratis* and since it differs in at least

<sup>21</sup> The vocabulary of *Epist.* 1, 2, and 3, written in the spring of 1339, shows borrowings from Apuleius in such words as *centuculus*, *gurgustiolum*, *antelucio*, *saepicula*, *blaterare*, and the phrase *larvale simulacrum*.

<sup>22</sup> Most notably the story of Cupid and Psyche in *Gen. deor.* v. 22 and ix. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Boccaccio's Apuleius clearly belongs to the same period as his Terence—i.e., not later than 1359 and probably not long after Laur. 29.8 (a notebook of miscellaneous contents, with items ranging in date from 1339 to 1347 or 1348) (see Hauvette, "Notes sur des manuscrits autographes de Boccaccio," *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist.*, XIV [1894], 87-134; Hecker, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35 and 59).

<sup>20</sup> (Bologna, 1892-93), I, 34; III, 91-92.

two important readings from  $\phi$  and from other known copies of F.<sup>24</sup> Boccaccio's manuscript contains on folio 56r an eight-line marginal addition to the text of *Met.* x. 21, which is also found in the margin of Laur. 29.2 ( $\phi$ ). The marginal addition in Boccaccio's manuscript is in a hand much later than the rest of the text, approximately contemporary with the hand of an autograph manuscript of the *Bucolicum carmen*, which was written not earlier than 1367.<sup>25</sup>

It is therefore obvious that we must recognize several different stages in Boccaccio's acquaintance with Apuleius and that his reading and copying of the text and his use of material from Apuleius in both his Latin and his Italian works must all be dated before he had any knowledge of Tacitus. The marginal addition in his copy of Apuleius may have been made about the time that he read the text of Tacitus; but it was made, not from Mediceus II, but from another manuscript of Apuleius, probably  $\phi$ .

There were, of course, perfectly legitimate means by which Boccaccio might have obtained a copy of Apuleius for reading in 1339 or for copying about 1348-50. Perhaps the most likely source was the library of his teacher, Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro, who had come to Naples

(probably in 1338) as professor of canon law—a man of wide reading and the author of a commentary on Valerius Maximus, one item of which may be derived from the *De deo Socratis* of Apuleius.<sup>26</sup> Dionigi's home, Borgo San Sepolcro, was about twenty-five miles northeast of Arezzo; and at Arezzo the notary Ser Simone had in 1338 bequeathed to the convent of the Fratres Praedicatorum a copy of Apuleius containing the *Apologia* and the *De deo Socratis*.<sup>27</sup> It is possible that Boccaccio borrowed a manuscript of Apuleius from Dionigi in 1339 and that, when he came back to Naples again in 1348, he was able to borrow either this manuscript or a related one for a long enough period to make his own copy.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Sabbadini, *op. cit.*, II, 36-40 and n. 33. At the time of his death Boccaccio owned a copy of Dionigi's commentary on Valerius Maximus, which appears in the inventory of the Parva Libreria as Item VIII.1.

<sup>25</sup> U. Pasqui, "La Biblioteca d'un notaro aretino del secolo xiv," *Arch. stor. ital.*, IV (5th ser.; 1889), 250-53. It is possible that the manuscript also contained the *Metamorphoses* and *Florida* (cf. Laur. 29.2, which is described in the heading as containing "Apuleius, *De magia*" [= *Apologia*], but which also contains the other two works). All known copies of the *Apologia*, *Metamorphoses*, and *Florida* seem to have been derived from the Monte Cassino manuscript now numbered Laur. 68.2 (cf. n. 24, above). On the other hand, the *De deo Socratis* and certain other works attributed to Apuleius (some genuine and some spurious) seem to have circulated in France (cf. the item from the Sorbonne [1338] cited by M. Manitius, "Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 67 [Leipzig, 1935], p. 149). In this respect, as in certain others, the library of Ser Simone seems to have represented a connecting link between the collections of France and those of southern Italy. Two other manuscripts from Monte Cassino, one of them containing the famous *Itinerarium Aetheriae* (formerly called *Peregrinatio Silvae*), somehow found their way to Arezzo (cf. Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, pp. 70 and 334).

<sup>26</sup> Among the items entered in Laur. 29.8 was a copy of Petrarch's *Epist. met.*, I, 4, inviting Dionigi to visit him near the fountain of the Sorgue. On the date of this letter (not earlier than the autumn of 1337 or later than the autumn of 1338) and of Dionigi's arrival in Naples see E. H. Wilkins, "The Dates of Three Letters of Petrarch," *Speculum*, XVI (1941), 485-86. Dionigi died in 1342; but this letter and other details about Petrarch entered in Laur. 29.8 could have been obtained from his estate. Probably his texts of classical authors would have been similarly available.

<sup>24</sup> C. Marchesi ("Per il testo del 'De Magia' di Apuleio," *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, XIX [1912], 294-304) quotes the variant readings of Laur. 54.32 for *Apol.* 1-17, 66-71, 101-3; and argues that Boccaccio's manuscript and the lost Codex Pithoeanus may represent a tradition independent of F and  $\phi$ . It seems to me more likely that these two manuscripts were derived from a copy of F different from, and perhaps earlier than,  $\phi$ . The important variants are the omission of *quam potestatem vereri* in *Apol.* 103, and the reading *inducat animum* in *Apol.* 56. Most of the variants quoted by Marchesi, such as *oblectamenta* for *oblectamenta* and *quam* for *quod* in *Apol.* 1, suggest, not a tradition essentially different from F and  $\phi$ , but difficulties encountered by Boccaccio or by the scribe of the manuscript that he was copying in deciphering the script or interpreting the abbreviations of his archetype.

<sup>25</sup> Hecker, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-61; Massera, *Opere latine minori*, p. 261.

He may also have obtained in a legitimate fashion the manuscript of Apuleius from which, about 1367, he made the marginal addition to Book x of the *Metamorphoses*. This manuscript was presumably Laur. 29.2; but we have no clue to its history beyond the fact that it belonged at one time to a certain Franciscus Aretinus, who signed his name at the close of the volume and who may have been responsible for some of the marginal and interlinear notes on the text.<sup>29</sup>

The manuscript of Varro must have come into Boccaccio's hands after 1347. When he wrote from Forlì at the beginning of 1348 to Zanobi da Strada in Florence, he evidently did not own a copy of Varro; he had been expecting to have one, he said, and would have had it if it had not been for his decision to accompany his host, Francesco degli Ordellaffi, who was to join King Louis of Hungary "in the most remote regions of Bruttium and Campania."<sup>30</sup> It seems a reasonable assumption that this manuscript was to come from some point south of Forlì and that it actually was the Cassinese codex now numbered Laur. 51.10, containing, together with Cicero's *Pro Cluentio* and the treatise *Ad Herennium*, the text of Varro's *De lingua Latina* v-x, from which

<sup>29</sup> A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum Latinorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae* (Florentiae, 1774-77), Vol. II, col. 5. On Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo (ca. 1416-ca. 1484), a friend of Lorenzo de' Medici, see E. Santini in *Encicl. ital.*, I (Roma, 1929), 268.

<sup>30</sup> *Epist.* 6, p. 128. The sentence follows statements about the copying of another manuscript and directions for its delivery. Boccaccio then compliments Zanobi on one of his compositions and continues: "Varronem quidem nondum habui; eram tamen habiturus in brevi, nisi itinera instarent ad illustrem Ungarie regem in extremis Brutiorum et Campanie quo moratur." With the phrase "in extremis Brutiorum" cf. *Ecl.* 4. 43-47; *De mont.*, s.v. "Caulon." Boccaccio follows the practice of Livy, Valerius Maximus, and other classical writers in substituting the name of the inhabitants (*Bruttii*) for the name of the district; and he evidently refers to the area designated by the word in classical times (i.e., the toe of the boot), even though in his own day the term "Calabria" (originally applied to the heel) had been transferred to the toe.

all other existing manuscripts and all our modern texts of the *De lingua Latina* are derived.<sup>31</sup> The manuscript evidently reached Boccaccio at some later date, for material from the portions of the *De lingua Latina* preserved in Laur. 51.10 appears both in the *De genealogia deorum* and in the *De montibus*.<sup>32</sup>

Boccaccio also made a copy (presumably complete) of the works of Cicero and Varro contained in this manuscript, to be sent as a gift to Petrarch. Petrarch's letter thanking him for the "librum ex Ciceronis ac Varronis opusculis eximiis prorsus et rarioris"<sup>33</sup> is undated, but the warmth of tone suggests personal acquaintance—i.e., a date after Petrarch and Boccaccio met in Florence in 1350; and the phrase "recepti ecce iterum a te librum" may link this gift with the copy of Augustine's commentary on the Psalms sent to Petrarch by Boccaccio in 1355.<sup>34</sup> Petrarch notes in the margin of his Livy (ii.14) that Varro differs from Livy on the derivation of the name "vicus Tuscus" (cf. Varro *LL* v.46); and the fact that he refers to the item as in the first book of the *De lingua Latina* shows that he mistook the first book of his codex for the first of the entire work.<sup>35</sup>

It is clear, then, that Boccaccio had Laur. 51.10 in his possession for a considerable time. No copy of Varro is listed in the Parva Libreria; so, if this manuscript formed part of the collection bequeathed

<sup>31</sup> It is, of course, possible that the manuscript which Boccaccio used was not the original codex from Monte Cassino but a copy; but there is not in the case of Varro, as there is in the case of Tacitus, evidence that he owned such a copy.

<sup>32</sup> E.g., *Gen., deor.*, III, 22 (Venus); IV, 44 (Prometheus); *De mont.*, s.vv. "Aventinus," "Capitolinus." The material from Varro in the *Genealogia deorum*, like that from Apuleius, appears in the main body of the text of Boccaccio's autograph manuscript, indicating a date not later than 1363. The *De montibus* was probably begun in 1362.

<sup>33</sup> *Fam.*, XVIII, 4.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>35</sup> P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme* (Paris, 1907), II, 31 and 114; Sabbadini, *op. cit.*, I, 30-31.

to Fra Martino, it had been removed from Santo Spirito before 1451. Laur. 51.10 has an annotation indicating that it was at one time in the library of San Marco, which would imply that it had previously belonged to Niccolò Niccoli;<sup>36</sup> hence the history of this manuscript after the fourteenth century was probably similar to that of Mediceus II of Tacitus.

The phrasing of Boccaccio's letter of 1348 from Forlì seems to indicate that, at the time that he wrote, the manuscript of Varro had already been removed from Monte Cassino and was being held for him by someone in southern Italy. If we try to discover who this person was, we should, I think, consider among the possibilities a man whom Boccaccio at this time still counted as a friend, Niccolò Acciaiuoli. Niccolò's father had been in business in Naples at the same period that Boccaccio's father had represented the Bardi there; and Niccolò himself had gone to Naples in 1331, had held positions of some importance under King Robert, and had been sent to the Morea in 1338, to defend the claims of the house of Anjou to the principality of Achaia. After three years of fighting, he returned to Italy and became the tutor of the young prince, Louis of Tarentum. In 1347, after the murder of Andrew of Hungary, he arranged the marriage between Queen Joanna and Louis of Tarentum; he accompanied Louis into exile in Provence and eventually was able to bring about the return of Joanna and Louis of Tarentum and the crowning of Louis as king.

<sup>36</sup> Bandini, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, cols. 529-33. For a Beneventan codex of Caesar that also belonged to Niccolò Niccoli see p. 228, below. Those who believe that he stole Mediceus II from the library of Santo Spirito will probably think that he removed the Varro and the Caesar from the same collection. The arguments advanced on p. 223, above, against assuming a theft of the Tacitus would hold for the other codices as well.

His kinsman Angelo Acciaiuoli, who was bishop of Florence from 1342 to 1355, accompanied Niccolò and Louis to Avignon in 1348 and was named "regni Siciliae Consiliarius" in 1349; he was appointed bishop of Monte Cassino in 1355; and, when he died in Naples in 1357, he was honored with a splendid funeral, in which King Louis himself took part.<sup>37</sup>

To this Niccolò, Boccaccio had written from Florence in 1341, protesting that Niccolò's departure three years before had caused him as much pain as the departure of Trojan Aeneas caused Carthaginian Dido and that he had longed for his return as eagerly as Penelope had longed for Ulysses, and indicating quite frankly that he would be grateful for Niccolò's help.<sup>38</sup> We do not know what response Niccolò made to his appeal; but the letter of 1348 to Zanobi da Strada is proof of friendly relations between Boccaccio and Angelo Acciaiuoli. Boccaccio refers to information received from Angelo about payment to the scribe who is copying a certain manuscript for Boccaccio and directs that this manuscript be delivered to Angelo. The manuscript of Varro had apparently been promised to Boccaccio about this same time, and Niccolò, as a person of considerable importance in southern Italy,

<sup>37</sup> On Angelo Acciaiuoli see F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra* (Venetis, 1717-22), Vol. I, cols. 388 and 576; vol. III, col. 148, with marginal note; A. Hortis, *Studi sulle opere latine del Boccaccio* (Trieste, 1879), p. 272, n. 2; De Nolhac, *op. cit.*, I, 201, n. 1; F. Forcellini, "Zanobi da Strada e la sua venuta nella corte di Napoli," *Arch. stor. per le prov. nap.*, XXXVII (1912), 244, n. 1. G. Traversari (*Le Lettere autografe di Giovanni Boccaccio* [Castelflorentino, 1905], p. 51, n. 1) calls him Niccolò's "fratello"; but we have Niccolò's own statement that he was his father's "unico fillo" (see L. Tanfani, *Niccolò Acciaiuoli* [Firenze, 1863], p. 20, n. 2). In a letter written to Zanobi da Strada in 1353 (*Epist.* 8, pp. 130 and 135) Boccaccio mentions his desire to visit Zanobi and Angelo in Naples but explains that he has given up the idea of coming because of his fear of being called a hanger-on of the rich and great.

<sup>38</sup> *Epist.* 5, pp. 125-26. The letter exists only in an Italian translation.

might have obtained it very easily from Monte Cassino. The fact that he and Boccaccio were on different sides in the conflict that followed the invasion of King Louis of Hungary and that Niccolò was then out of the country for a fairly long period may have delayed the delivery of the manuscript; but there is no doubt that Boccaccio received it eventually.

By the winter of 1362-63, however, the situation had altered. Niccolò had been made Grand Seneschal of the Neapolitan kingdom, had carried on a successful campaign for the Angevins in Sicily, had been named Count of Malta and Gozo, and was in a position to play "Maecenas" to men of letters. When he invited Boccaccio to come to visit him, it was undoubtedly with the idea that Boccaccio would record for posterity Niccolò's achievements and the honors that he had received. This Boccaccio was unwilling to do; and the lack of consideration shown him during the visit, together with the physical hardships that he endured, completely changed his feelings toward his host. After he had left Naples and traveled north to Petrarch's home in Venice, he poured forth in a long letter to Niccolò's steward, Francesco Nelli, all the bitterness of his soul.<sup>39</sup> It is from this letter that we learn that Niccolò was a man of excellent native ability but without formal education; that he had written *molte epistole volgari*, one of which had had a wide circulation, and had composed in French an account of his Sicilian campaigns. Boccaccio speaks scornfully of Niccolò's desire to be considered *litterato ed amico delle Muse*; of the large number of books in his collection and of his habit of alluding ostentatiously to this volume

or that as being in his *armario*, when he had only glanced through it or had not read it at all; and he sums up with cutting force the methods by which this library had been assembled: "tutti ancora libri, per ragione o per forza o per dono o per prezzo o per rapina aggregati."

Before Niccolò set out for Achaia in 1338, he left directions in his will that, if he did not return, a Certosa should be built in his memory and should be called San Lorenzo. His melancholy presentiment was not fulfilled, and he was able himself to attend to the building of the Certosa, which was begun in 1342 at Galluzzo, in the valley of the Ema, about four miles southwest of Florence, and was finished in 1355. His last will, drawn up on September 30, 1359, bequeathed all his books to this Certosa; but there is reason to believe that, instead of waiting for the terms of the bequest to be carried out after his death, he presented certain volumes in person when he passed through Florence in December of that same year, on his way to Avignon.<sup>40</sup> Niccolò's sister Lapa, the wife of Manente Buondelmonti, made an inventory in Naples in 1359 of the ninety-eight books in Niccolò's library; and it seems probable that these books are referred to in the letter written by Boccaccio to Nelli in 1363. Boccaccio has declared that Niccolò is the enemy, rather than the friend, of the Muses and that he has no intention of writing a eulogy of him. He continues:

Ed acciò che l'animo mio non ti sia nascoso, io sono per volgermi in contrario se egli non apre la prigione alla moltitudine de' libri i quali appresso ad alcuni oziosi uomini, i quali non molto di lungi da Firenze nobilmente pasce, sotto chiave di diamante ha riposti; quasi per questo molti abbiano girato il mondo e cercati gli Studi di diverse nazioni, le notti

<sup>39</sup> *Epist.* 12, esp. pp. 167-68. Except for a short fragment of the original Latin letter, dated "Venetiis, ii kalendas Julii," the letter exists only in an Italian translation.

<sup>40</sup> Sabbadini, "I Libri del gran siniscalco Nicola Accialotti," *Il Libro e la stampa*, I (1907), 33-40.

sanza sonno abbiano guidate e con ogni effetto abbiano sudato, acciò che le fatiche loro diventassano esca delle tignuole e della polvere.<sup>41</sup>

There is a striking resemblance between the monks of Monte Cassino, as Boccaccio saw them on the visit described by Benvenuto da Imola, and the *oziosi uomini* of the Certosa of San Lorenzo. We note, too, the same bitter contrast between the labor of producing or collecting a fine lot of books and their pitiful condition in the monastic library, neglected and covered with dust. Either Boccaccio's experience at the two places was remarkably similar, or else the two experiences were similarly interpreted in the light of later reflection.

There is also a striking parallel to this letter to Nelli in Boccaccio's eighth eclogue, entitled "Midas" and written, as Boccaccio explains in a letter of later date, *de quodam domino avarissimo*. The *dominus* in question is not named; but the close resemblance to Boccaccio's letter, particularly in such details as the literary aspirations of "Midas" and the contrast between his humble origin and his later arrogance, makes it practically certain that Niccolò Acciaiuoli is meant.<sup>42</sup> The language of the eclogue is even stronger than that of the letter; Midas is denounced as "fur, . . . mechus [= moechus] scelerumque satelles," and the whole countryside is represented as suffering from his cruelty.

Among the books listed by Lapa in 1359 were Boethius *De consolacione*, Josephus, Juvenal, Priscian, Seneca, Solinus *De mirabilibus mundi*, Valerius Maximus, Vergil, a *Liber Vitelii* [i.e., *Vitruvii*] *de architectura*, and the *Gesta*

*piissimi Apollonie* [sic] *Tirii regis*. It should be remembered that a copy of Hegesippus (Josephus) is one of the Cassinese manuscripts now in the Laurentian Library and that the Laurentian Library also has a volume in a Beneventan hand containing (*inter alia*) the history of Apollonius of Tyre.<sup>43</sup> It should be remembered also that Angelo Acciaiuoli was bishop of Monte Cassino from the summer of 1355 until his death in the autumn of 1357.

Since Niccolò himself lived until November 8, 1365, there was time after the completion of the inventory for him to make numerous additions to his library; and, by the terms of his will, all such accessions would have come to the Certosa after his death. One of these books may have been the eleventh-century manuscript of Caesar (Laur. 68.8), which, although not in a Beneventan hand, was the archetype of the codex copied in some scriptorium of southern Italy at the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century (Laur. 68.6). The latter codex belonged in the fifteenth century to Niccolò Niccoli; Laur. 68.8 bears on the first folio the name of the owner in the genitive case: *Nicolai Acciaiuoli de Flor(entia)*.<sup>44</sup>

In a matter involving so many uncertainties, it is impossible to speak with assurance; but the evidence seems to point to the following conclusions: the visit paid by Boccaccio to Monte Cassino may have occurred in 1348 or in 1362 or 1370; but he could not at any one of these three dates have removed all the manu-

<sup>41</sup> Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 339.

<sup>42</sup> *Epist.* 12, p. 168. For a description (with drawing) of the Certosa, see E. Hutton, *Country Walks about Florence* (New York, 1909), pp. 139-40.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. esp. ll. 43-56 and 98-101. For Boccaccio's own statement about the eclogue see *Epist.* 23, p. 218.

<sup>44</sup> Bandini, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, cols. 838-39 and 840. On Laur. 68.6 see Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 339. Lowe simply lists the manuscript as Beneventan, without assigning it to a scriptorium. The fact that other important classical manuscripts were copied at Monte Cassino may indicate that Laur. 68.6 was also written there; and the agreement of certain abbreviations in this manuscript with forms used at Monte Cassino may point in the same direction (see Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 194, under "tempus").

scripts that he is accused of having stolen from Monte Cassino. It is certain that he did not in 1348 remove Laur. 68.2 (Apuleius and Tacitus), and it is unlikely that he removed Laur. 51.10 (Varro). He probably had Laur. 51.10 in his possession in 1348 or shortly thereafter; but there is no proof that he retained possession of this manuscript to the end of his life. He may have stopped at Monte Cassino in 1370 and may have taken Laur. 68.2 at this time; but his use of material from Apuleius and his copying and later revision of the text were independent of this codex; and the only copy of Tacitus of which there is a record in his library was a manuscript different from Laur. 68.2.

The person mainly responsible for the removal of classical texts from Monte Cassino may have been Niccolò Acciaiuoli, who would have been in a position to use the methods of *forza*, *dono*, *prezzo*, and *rapina* with which Boccaccio credits him and who would have found it especially easy to get manuscripts from Monte Cassino through his kinsman Angelo. It is probable that Boccaccio shared, or at least to some extent profited by, Niccolò's collection of manuscripts up to the winter of 1362-63. It is even possible that, on the basis of a suggestion from Niccolò or an understanding with his agents, Boccaccio stopped at Monte Cassino on the way to Naples in 1362 and removed certain volumes. His half-brother Jacopo and a servant were with him at this time,<sup>45</sup> so that he would have had some assistance. He certainly had a number of books with him on this visit, for he tells of callers who came to his quarters in Tripergoli, *tratti dalla fama de' libri*, and speaks of himself as shackled by them (*legato con quella catena*) when he contemplated a move.<sup>46</sup> The extraordinary virulence of his attack

on Niccolò in the letter of 1363 may have been due in part to the fact that he had been deprived of texts to which he felt he had a right and of which he was sure that he would have made better use than either Niccolò himself or the *oziosi uomini* in his Certosa.

It is possible that after Niccolò's death on November 8, 1365, the "prison" at Galluzzo was less strongly barred and that Boccaccio had access to some of Niccolò's books. He must have been at the church of San Felice, in the valley of the Ema, only a short distance from Galluzzo, about 1367, for he copied at that time, and preserved in one of his notebooks, a Greek epitaph on a dog that he found there.<sup>47</sup> It may have been about the same time that he added in the margin of his copy of Apuleius the extra sentence found in the margin of Laur. 29.2. Perhaps he also copied from Laur. 68.8 or Laur. 68.6 the text of the *Bellum civile* which forms the basis of the summary of events of the Civil War in a notebook which Boccaccio used in his later years.<sup>48</sup> He may even

<sup>47</sup> Hauvette, "Notes," p. 101; Hecker, *op. cit.*, p. 59; G. Biagi, *Lo Zibaldone Boccacesco Mediceo Laurenziano* (Firenze, 1915), p. 4.

<sup>48</sup> The notebook is Bib. naz. Lat. II.II.327, which also contains items from Pliny corresponding to material inserted in the margin of the autograph manuscript of the *Genealogia deorum*. The wording of the summary indicates that Boccaccio ascribed not only the *Bellum civile* and its supplements, but the eighth book of the *Bellum Gallicum*, to a certain Suetonius Tranquillus, "forsan proavus" of the author of the *Vitae Caesarum*; and the text shows that he was using a manuscript related to Laur. 68.8 (L of the Oxford edition) and Laur. 68.6 (I). Examples of such readings are: BC 1. 8. 3 ne; 9. 2 contumelia; 9. 5 a; 14. 4 intra; 23. 1 illuxit. Boccaccio certainly owned two copies of Caesar, which were both included in the inventory made of the Parva Libreria in 1451: Item VII.7, a text of the *Bellum Gallicum* alone, listed as "Commentaria Celsi Julii Caesaris de bello gallico"; and VII.6, a volume containing the *Bellum Gallicum* and the *Bellum civile*, with the supplementary narratives, through the *Bellum Hispaniense*, listed as "Julius Celsus de bello gallico et Suetonius Tranquillus de bello ciuili." The contents of Item VII.6 agree with those of L and I; but Boccaccio's manuscript was obviously different from I, since the latter manuscript was in the possession of Niccolò Niccoli before his death in 1437 and must have been in the library of San

<sup>45</sup> *Epist.* 12, pp. 150 and 155.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 154-55.

have gone through the toilsome process of copying for his own use "Id quod de Cornelio Tacito reperitur." Since he already owned a text of Apuleius, he would not have needed to copy this part of Laur. 68.2, and he could have spent his time, instead, on the text of Vitruvius, which had been in the Certosa since 1359. If

Marco at the time that the inventory of the Parva Libreria was made; and it was apparently not L, since L (like the related manuscript, Laur. 68.7) gives the name Julius Celsus at the beginning of Book I of the *Gallie War* and in the subscriptions to later books, only in the formula, "Tullius Celsus Constantinus v. c. legi," whereas Boccaccio's manuscript gave "Julius Celsus" as the author's name at the beginning of the *Bellum Gallicum* and (like the fourteenth-century MS Laur. 68.11) attributed the *Bellum civile* to Suetonius Tranquillus. If Boccaccio himself copied the text of Caesar, he probably made the copy from a borrowed book, supplying what he considered correct headings. See also G. Vandelli, "Lo Zibaldone Magliabechiano.... del Boccaccio," *Studi di filologia italiana*, I (1927), 79-85.

these assumptions hold, it was this copy of Tacitus and Vitruvius, made by Boccaccio himself, from which Niccolò da Montefalcone borrowed a quaternion; and we have no means of knowing whether the quaternion was ever returned.

On this theory, Niccolò Niccoli would have obtained from the library of the Certosa at Galluzzo, rather than from Santo Spirito, MSS Laur. 68.2 (Apuleius and Tacitus), Laur. 51.10 (Varro *De lingua Latina*), and the manuscript of Caesar numbered 68.6. He would probably have offered the monks of the Certosa some compensation for these manuscripts, but, even so, there might have been considerable gossip about each one, as to *unde exierit et per quem*.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

# A LABOR CONTRACT OF A.D. 164: *CIL*, III, P. 948, NO. X

ADOLF BERGER

THE wax-tablet inscription, *CIL*, III, p. 948, No. X, belongs to the group of the so-called *Tabellae ceratae Daciae* of around the middle of the second century after Christ found in the gold-mining district of the ancient Alburnus Maior in Dacia (now Verespatak in Transylvania). Some of these wooden triptychs, published first in *CIL*, III, pp. 921 ff., are well known in the Romanistic literature because of their important contribution to the knowledge of Roman law as handled in the provinces in the best times of its development. Therefore, they have found acceptance in all collections of Roman legal texts preserved in inscriptions, papyri, etc., such as *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui* of Bruns (7th ed., 1909, by Mommsen and Gradenwitz) or *Textes de droit romain* of Girard (6th ed., by Senn, 1937), and recently in the excellent edition of *Negotia*, published in 1943 as the third volume of the Italian collection *Fontes iuris Romani anteiustiniani* (hereafter cited as "*FIRA*"). Thus our labor contract, with which the editor Arangio-Ruiz had already dealt some years earlier in his survey of recent epigraphic literature and sources,<sup>1</sup> has now been re-edited and commented on, which offers me the opportunity to make a few additional and critical remarks within the frame of a general analysis of this highly interesting text. It is taken for granted that what former commentators, P. Laborerie<sup>2</sup> and particularly J. Carcopino,<sup>3</sup> have said needs no repetition; but further explana-

tory notes appear necessary, and there are some misunderstandings to be corrected.

Two similar documents, belonging to the same group but less well preserved, were published in *CIL*, III, pp. 948, 949, as Nos. IX and XI.<sup>4</sup>

The following text is a copy of Arangio-Ruiz's edition in *FIRA*, III, 466 f., No. 150:

- 1 Macrino et Celso cos. XIII Kal(endas) Iunias. Flavius Secundinus scripsi rogatus a Memmio Asclepi, quia se lit[ter]as scire negavit, it quod dixit se locas[se] et locavit operas s[ua]s opere aurario Aurelio Adiutori ex ha[c] die [in] idus Novembres proximas [(denariis) sel]ptaginta cibarisque. [Mercede]m per [te]mpora accipere
- 5 debebit. S[ua]s operas sanas va[le]ntes [ede]re debebit conductori [s(u]pra) s(crypto)].
- Quod si invito condu[c]tore recedere aut cessare voluer[it, da]re debebit in dies singulos (sestertios) V numeratos de sum[ma] m[erced]is. Quod si] fluor impedierit, pro rata computare debebi[t]. Conduc[tor] si tem[po]re peracto mercedem sol[v]endi moram fecerit, ead[em] ploena]
- 10 tenebitur exceptis cessatis tribus.
- Actum Immenoso Maiori.

(Signatures)

Titus Beusantis qui et Bradua  
Socratio Socratonis  
Memmius Asclepi

## TRANSLATION

Under the consulship of Macrinus and Celsus, on the thirteenth day before the Calends of June.

<sup>4</sup> The scattered remarks of other scholars on the Dacian *locationes*, based on earlier and now superseded readings, do not require particular attention.

<sup>1</sup> *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris*, V (1939), 621 f.; hereafter cited as "*SD*."

<sup>2</sup> *Revue générale de droit et législation*, XXXIII (1909), 193 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Revue de philologie*, LXIII (1937), 99 ff.

I, Flavius Secundinus, wrote this at the request of Memmius, son of Asclepius, because he said that he was illiterate. He declared that he had let out on hire his services, and he hired out his services (as a laborer) in the gold mine to Aurelius Adiutor from today until the Ides of November next for 70 denarii and board. He shall receive the wages on (fixed) dates. He shall render his services as those of a healthy workman and valuable to the above-mentioned *conductor*. If he should withdraw or interrupt (his work) against the will of the *conductor*, he shall pay five sesterces for each day, to be counted out from the sum of the wages. Should inundation impede (the work), he shall calculate a proportional reduction (of the wages). Should the *conductor* make a delay in the payment of the wages, he will be subject to the same penalty, three days being excepted (from penalty).

Done at Immenosus Maior. (Three signatures.)

The document was written in a small settlement, Immenosus Maior, situated in the neighborhood of Alburnus Maior, which is known from other inscriptions as an important spot in the Dacian gold mines.<sup>5</sup>

As to the persons involved, no fewer than five names appear in the document: the writer, the worker and his employer, and two others who signed the document together with the worker, without, however, indicating their role in the transaction.

The document was written down at the request of the worker, Memmius Asclepi, by a man whose official or private character is not indicated. He mentions only his name and the fact that he wrote the document after having been requested to do it (*scripsi rogatus*) by the worker, who declared that he was illiterate. It is interesting that the latter, nevertheless, signed

<sup>5</sup> See Tomaschek, *RE*, I, 1338. No. XI was written there. The connection between the gold mines of Immenosus Maior and Alburnus Maior is evidenced by the fact that one of the persons who signed No. X also appears in No. XI (see below).

*manu propria* the document in a manner which, according to the illustration in *CIL*, is no worse than the writing of the others. We know of this type of ἀγράμματοι, who have a heavy hand for writing (βραδέως γράφοντες); they are very frequent in the Greek papyri. It is, however, worth while mentioning that in the two other tablets, Nos. IX and XI, the workers are illiterate, too. Juristically important is the fact that the document was written down at the worker's request (no matter whether illiterate or not), which means that he had the right to ask for a written statement. The formula, *scripsi rogatus*, was a common one: it appears in the so-called *apochae Pompeianae*, in which the writer declares: *scripsi rogatu*, that is, at the request of the person involved (cf. *CIL*, IV, p. 3340, Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXX, XL [= *FIRA*, III, Nos. 129a, b; 130e, g]). The writer of the labor contract was probably a clerk in the office of the administration of the gold mine designated in our inscription as *opus aurarium*.<sup>6</sup> His good Latin name, Flavius Secundinus, sounds like that of a freedman, which would fit well with his job in the management of the mine.

The laborer, Memmius Asclepi, is, as Arangio-Ruiz correctly points out,<sup>7</sup> against Barrow and Taubenschlag, not a slave but the son of Asclepius. The references to the papyri given by Taubenschlag<sup>8</sup> are irrelevant, since this contract is a purely Roman affair. A slave could never

<sup>6</sup> I could not find another instance of this term. The *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* does not even list our inscription. Hirschfeld (*Kais. Verwaltungsbeamte* [2d ed., 1905], p. 155) speaks of *opus auri*, a phrase which, to the best of my knowledge, does not occur anywhere. In No. XI, it is true, the *editio princeps* in *CIL* has *opere auri oius* . . . , but the later editions of Bruns-Mommsen-Gradenwitz, *Fontes*, I<sup>2</sup> (1909), 371, and Arangio-Ruiz, *FIRA*, p. 468, corrected the reading into *opere aur(ar)io ius* . . .

<sup>7</sup> *FIRA*, III, 467, n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> *Zeitschr. Savigny-Stift., Rom. Abt.*, L (1930), 158, n. 4.

assume similar obligations without his master's consent. Moreover, the names of the other two cosignatories of the document are also provided with the fathers' names in the genitive, and both those individuals appear in Nos. IX and XI as parties to the contract. Finally, a penalty clause in favor of the laborer, of the kind found in our document, could not have been included if he had been a slave.

The second party, the employer, is not present at the conclusion of the agreement, and his signature does not appear, though his name, Aurelius Adiutor, is mentioned in the text. So far, the *cognomen*, Adiutor, has not been questioned by anybody. It is true that Adiutor appears as a *cognomen* in the name of high officials in two instances<sup>9</sup> and not so rarely in connection with individuals of unknown origin and career, or slaves.<sup>10</sup> We have even in the same volume of *CIL* (III, No. 5230) another Aurelius Adiutor. But it is striking that, within the small group of persons acting in one way or another in the administration of the gold mines of Dacia, two persons appear contemporarily with this uncommon name. In our document it is the principal of the laborer, Aurelius Adiutor, and in No. IX it is the writer of the document, a certain Adiutor Macari, which may mean simply "Adiutor, son of Macarius." In my opinion, however, the possibility cannot be excluded that the name is somehow connected with the job of the persons. They were perhaps slaves by origin who, as freedmen, accepted the name attached to their profession. A defective name like Adiutor Macari suggests such a hypothesis, which, of course, cannot be pursued further on this occasion. It may suffice here to note that *adiutor* generally indi-

cates "any person who co-operates in acts, transactions, and offices of any kind, in more or less immediate or hierarchical dependency on another."<sup>11</sup> In provincial administration *adiutor* is a very frequent title of assistant functionaries.<sup>12</sup> The Dacian gold mines were either under direct administration of imperial procurators or were managed indirectly through a lease to *conductores*,<sup>13</sup> following the general practice in the administration of mines. In both cases *adiutores* might well have been in the administrative staff. It would have been quite natural that an engagement of a laborer should be handled by a subordinate rather than by a high imperial official or the rich private entrepreneur. It seems likely that, even when the mine was leased to a private *conductor*, an officer from the procuratorial office, an *adiutor*, was attached to the administration of the mine in a supervisory capacity.

We do not know whether the mines of Immenosus Maior and Alburnus Maior were administered directly by an imperial procurator or indirectly by a lessee (*conductor*), which seems more probable. But it must be stressed that the term *conductor* mentioned in the three documents refers to persons to whom as *their conductores*<sup>14</sup> the laborers (*locatores*) hired out themselves and not to *conductores* of the fisc.<sup>15</sup>

The two persons who signed the document with the worker are, in my opinion,

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 79.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Habel, *RE*, I, 364; De Ruggiero, *op. cit.*, s.v.; Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. sel.*, III, 414 f.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Davies, *Roman Mines in Europe* (1935), p. 11; Täckholm, *Studien über den römischen Bergbau der Kaiserzeit* (Upsala, 1937), pp. 105 ff., 113 ff.

<sup>14</sup> As Hirschfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 155) seems to assume.

<sup>15</sup> It is worth mentioning that the term *conductor* is not attached to the first mention of the employers, Aurelius Adiutor and Socrates Socratonis (in No. XI), but appears later without the respective proper names, only with the addition *s(upra) s(cripto)*, as in No. XI, or without it.

<sup>9</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup>, II (1936), 79, 274; *P Flor.*, I, No. 6, n. 1.

<sup>10</sup> See De Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico*, I (1895), 81.

also members of the administrative personnel. They acted in the name of the general manager of the mine, not necessarily as *socii susceptoris*, as Arangio-Ruiz suggests.<sup>16</sup> He correctly stresses the fact that in the two other contracts they appear as the hirers of the laborers; but his assumption that they signed as *adiecti solutionis causa*<sup>17</sup> is untenable. In Roman terminology an *adiectus solutionis causa* was included in an agreement for receiving payment from the debtor in place of the original creditor,<sup>18</sup> whereas in our case no payment by the worker enters into consideration, since penalties to be paid by him were to be deducted from the wages. In my opinion, the two men signed the document simply as administrative clerks of the mine. This does not contradict the fact that in the two other documents, Nos. IX and XI, each of them appears as the "acting" *conductor*.

The procedure involved in writing down such labor agreements seems to me quite clear. The laborer appears in the office of the mine administration and requests written confirmation that he has been hired. One of the clerks in the administrative office writes down the most important clauses of the agreement, and two others, who happen to be present, sign the document in the absence of the high imperial official or the private *conductor*. Since both parties assume some obligations, somebody must also sign for the employer; but that, after all, was a simple formality, because all contracts with the mineworkers were drafted according to a fixed scheme. The mine principal took no risk that his agents would assume some particularly onerous liabilities for him. Even a simple clerk

<sup>16</sup> FIRA, III, 467, n. 7. (He certainly thought of the *socii et actores* of the *Lex metalli Vipascensis*.)

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> See Arangio-Ruiz, *Istituzioni di diritto romano* (9th ed., 1947), p. 393.

could therefore be intrusted with the signing of a labor contract.

The appearance of the same persons in different localities shows that the administrative personnel worked for several mines in one district.

The tablet is of the type which the Roman jurist Paul, in his *Sentences* v. 25. 6 calls "*tabulae quae publici vel privati contractus scripturam continent*." Its content is a labor contract (*locatio conductio operarum*), although it was written at the request of only one of the contracting parties, the worker. According to Roman rules, a written document was not necessary for the conclusion of the contract. But it is easily understandable that in provincial practice the worker may have wanted to have in hand a written statement of the agreement. Paul also speaks of *testibus adhibitis signari*. But the decree of the *amplissimus ordo* (the Senate) mentioned by him prescribed only the rules as to how the tablets were to be arranged and signed in order to prevent falsification. For the validity of a *locatio conductio* contract itself no witnesses were necessary. In our case the presence of other witnesses would be all the more superfluous, since, first, there was the man who wrote the document, then the worker confirmed the accuracy of the text by his signature,<sup>19</sup> and, finally, there are the signatures of two men who were somehow connected with the management of the mine and who participated in the act on behalf of the principal.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> In No. IX the presence of the worker is noted: *coram ipso praesenti*.

<sup>20</sup> With regard to our document, Karlowa (*Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, I [1885], 798) makes the following remark: "He who speaks and formulates the reciprocal obligations is the *locator*, as in each *locatio conductio*, therefore here the laborer." I do not know whence Karlowa inferred this generalization, which is contrary to the Roman conception of an agreement with reciprocal obligations of the parties—not to speak of the picture that we have in the Greek papyri.

The absence of certain details in our labor contract, such as the hours and kind of work to be done by the worker, holidays, or any indication of the periods in which he was to receive his wages, may be explained by the existence of general regulations governing work in the mine and the relations between laborer and employer. These regulations were doubtless publicly announced in the mine for all workers, and it is quite understandable that many a worker did not even ask for a special written document. From the three documents preserved we learn that special clauses were admissible, concerning partial payment of the wages in advance, for instance (No. XI), or something similar.

As was said before, our document is a labor contract which has all the features of a Roman *locatio conductio operarum*: the laborer is the *locator* ("dixit se locasse et locavit operas suas"),<sup>21</sup> the employer is the *conductor*. The use of the respective terms is perfectly correct. It is simply a misunderstanding when one of the commentators<sup>22</sup> says that the worker is simultaneously both *locator* and *locatus*: "he is both subject and object [?] of the act to which he adheres." This is contrary to Roman terminology, which knows *locare rem, opus, operas*, but not *locatio* of a free man *sui iuris*. Besides, the phrase quoted above states precisely that the worker is the *locator* who *locavit operas suas*. *Dixit*—or *fatetur* in No. XI—means the same as *ὁμολογῆναι* in the language of the papyri. In the phrase quoted, the words *et locavit* may perhaps appear superfluous. As a parallel to *dixit* they indicate, as a counterstatement to the unilateral assertion of the worker, that he

has, in fact, begun his work. It is highly interesting that a similar construction appears in *CIL*, III, p. 949, No. XII, a document concerning a loan of money, in which the debtor "*dixit se accepisse et accepit*" a sum of money.<sup>23</sup> The document was also written in Alburnus Maior. The awkward-sounding construction was perhaps customary local usage.

The corresponding obligations of the employer are not preceded by an appropriate declaration with *dixit*, but the firm statement that the worker must receive the salary (*accipere debebit*) does not admit of any doubt about the employer's engagements.

The language of the document, despite awkwardness in a few expressions (*dixit se locasse*, etc., *exceptis cessatis tribus*) is in surprising agreement with the language of the best classical jurists. One has the impression of reading a text of the *Digest*. From the following list of expressions and phrases that our inscription has in common with juristic writings, it is not too bold to assume that the legal adviser of the procuratorial office who composed the model contract to be used in the administration of the mines was well trained in Roman juristic language.

Beginning with *edere operas*, which in the juristic sources is the technical term for rendering services in a *locatio conductio operarum* (cf. *Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae* [VIR], II, 434. 43–46), along with *operas suas locare* (VIR, IV, 437. 3–9), we note: *tempore peracto* (Dig. xl. 7. 40. 2); *poena teneri* (VIR, V, 1010. 10 ff.); *moram facere* (VIR, II, 745. 38 ff.); *ex die, in diem* (Idus, VIR, II, 259. 31 ff., 257. 42 ff.); *in dies singulos* (VIR, II, 251. 2); for *recedere a contractu*, see VIR, V, 19. 22 ff.; for *discedere* used in

<sup>21</sup> The same phrase occurs in No. IX, and "*fatetur se locasse et locavit*" in No. XI.

<sup>22</sup> Carcopino, *op. cit.*, p. 99. The same mistake occurs in his translation, p. 97: "il a déclaré s'être loué et il a loué ses services," since *se* is the subject of *locasse*, the object of which is *operas suas*.

<sup>23</sup> "*Dixit se accepisse et habere*," as in Dacian wax tablets Nos. VI–VIII, XI, XXV (=FIRA, III, Nos. 87–90, 150b) or the papyrus PSI, VI, 729 (=FIRA, III, No. 136), sounds, of course, much better.

No. IX (= *recedere*), see *VIR*, II, 273. 38; for *per tempora*, see *VIR*, IV, 608 f. and V, 977. 2 ff.; for *mercedem accipere debebit*, see *VIR*, II, 55. 9 ff., combined with I, 87. 31. *Mora solvendi* is as good as *mora solutionis* or *solventium* (cf. *VIR*, V, 615. 51) and is as familiar in Romanistic literature as *mora debitoris*.<sup>24</sup> *Pro rata computare* has its counterpart in *Dig. v. 4. 6. 1*<sup>25</sup> (see also *VIR*, V, 83. 23). Finally, *quod si* is a very frequent conjunction in juristic texts in order to introduce new factual situations juridically relevant (see *VIR*, V, 444. 1–26, list not complete).

The worker is hired for the period from May 20 to November 13, i.e., 5 months and 25 days—altogether, 178 days. There seems no way to bring the wages of 70 denarii (= 280 sesterces = 1,120 asses) into an arithmetical relationship with the duration of the contract.<sup>26</sup> Carcopino<sup>27</sup> starts from the idea that, since “2 et 4 sont les seuls diviseurs communs à 12, nombre des mois de l’année, et 70, nombre des deniers de la rémunération,” wages had to be paid either six times a year on the Ides, or three times on the Ides of November, March, and July. He prefers the latter because in all three documents November 13 is a payday, being the end of the hiring term. Thus our Memmius would have received 35 denarii on the Ides of July, after 1 month and 27 days of work,<sup>28</sup> and the remaining 35 denarii on the Ides of November after an

additional 4 months’ work. This interpretation seems to me unacceptable not only because the worker would have been without any wages at all for long periods (4 and nearly 2 months, respectively) but also because *per tempora* must refer to a larger number of instalments than merely two. The figure 70 (or 280)<sup>29</sup> is also divisible by 5 and 10, and there seems no reason why the worker should not have received his wages in shorter periods instead of having to wait months. Payment in sesterces makes that easily possible. The daily pay was a little more than 1½ sesterces. The precise *tempora* on which the mineworkers were to be paid were certainly fixed in the general mine regulations; hence the paydays were not mentioned in the individual contracts.

The circumstance that in all three documents the contract expires on the Ides of November, A.D. 164, is very interesting. In my opinion it has nothing to do with a payday at the end of a 4 months’ term, as Carcopino suggests. The date was doubtless of a certain importance in the administration of the mine. Either it marked the end of the lease of the mine to the private *conductor*, so that all labor contracts had to expire on that day, which seems to me the most likely solution, or it was somehow connected with the management of the mine. Perhaps local usage required the renewal of all labor contracts on the same day, and thus the engagement of new laborers made in the meantime also had to expire on exactly that day.<sup>30</sup>

The wages (*merces*) as established above—a little more than 1½ sesterces

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Heumann-Seckel, *Handlexikon zu den Quellen des röm. Rechts* (9th ed., 1909), s.v. “mora,” b.

<sup>25</sup> As Arangio-Ruiz has already remarked (see *SD*, p. 622, n. 74).

<sup>26</sup> The various calculations made by scholars are all more or less incorrect. Laborerie (*op. cit.*, p. 196) counts 56 sesterces monthly, which is obviously wrong. Arangio-Ruiz (*SD*, p. 622, n. 74) speaks of 2½ sesterces as the daily pay and Carcopino of 2½—both incorrect, as appears from a simple division of the total wages by the number of the days (see below).

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 100.

<sup>28</sup> Not 2 months and 26 days, as Carcopino (*op. cit.*, p. 101) says.

<sup>29</sup> And so also the sum of 105 denarii (= 420 sesterces) in No. XI.

<sup>30</sup> The dating of No. IX in Bruns, *Fontes*, I<sup>1</sup> (p. 370, No. 165.2), A.D. 164, is misleading. The contract was concluded in A.D. 163, as we see from the names of the eponymous consuls, A. Iulius Pastor (see Groag, *RE*, X, 1074) and M. Pontius Laelianus (see *ibid.*, XII, 399. 50) and expired on the Ides of the next year, A.D. 164.

daily—certainly appear very low. But here Carcopino's ingenious correction of the first editor's reading offers an excellent solution of the problem: *cibarisque*<sup>31</sup> instead of the former *liberisque*, which was incomprehensible.<sup>32</sup> The worker received food from his employer besides the modest salary. *Cibaria* in Roman juristic language means food alone and is sharply distinguished from clothing (*vestiaria*) and lodging (*habitatio*) when bequeathed in a legacy (cf. *Dig.* xxxiv. 1. 6). Together they are called *alimenta*. Therefore, the term *cibaria* can hardly be extended to the other two kinds of allowances. It is worth mentioning that T. Frank, who did not know the reading *cibaria* when he wrote his *Economic History of Rome* (1927), asserted<sup>33</sup> that the salary was doubtless in addition to board and lodging. In spite of the limited significance of *cibaria*, I would not definitely reject this suggestion, although in *Dig.* xxxiv. 1. 21 Ulpian expressly states—with regard to last wills—that “*cibariis relictis neque habitationem neque vestiarius deberi palam est.*” With reference to later wills this strict interpretation is understandable; but it is likely that in such small settlements as *Immenosus Maior* there were common barracks for all mine workers belonging to the mine. This is not mentioned in the document itself, perhaps because the question was settled in the general regulations of the mine and the value of the lodging was calculated in the cash salary. If true, that would be one more argument for the low amount of the salary. The

problem cannot be solved, of course, on the base of the text, which, strictly interpreted, is against such a solution.

Unfortunately, in the Dacian inscriptions we do not find any basis which could illustrate the local market prices and thus serve as a foundation for judging whether the wages of Aurelius Asclepi were low, and, if so, how low. The prices paid for slaves (a female slave, a slave boy, and a slave girl)<sup>34</sup> in Dacian sale tablets of about the middle of the second century after Christ are of no use for our purposes. A reference may be made, however, to soldiers' pay, for which we have some figures. In the time of Domitian it was 300 denarii per annum, which was increased by Commodus to 375 denarii.<sup>35</sup> If we take into account the fact that the soldier's stipend did not include food, our miner's salary plus board, even without lodging, represents a greater value than 300 denarii, reckoning the food at the same low daily rate as the salary in cash, therefore together a little more than 3 sesterces daily. Perhaps the value of the nourishment was even higher, since the daily penalty for the miner was 5 sesterces.

Carcopino's reading is supported by a few instances in the epigraphic material and indirectly by analogous provisions in labor contracts preserved in the Greco-

<sup>31</sup> *CIL*, III, p. 959, No. XXV; p. 940, No. VII, and p. 937, No. VI; Suppl., p. 2215. Cf. also Arangio-Ruiz, *FIRA*, III, Nos. 87–89.

<sup>32</sup> Domaszewski's study of the soldiers' pay (“*Truppensold der Kaiserzeit*,” *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1900, pp. 218 ff.) is still fundamental. See Lammert, *RE*, IIIA, 2537; Mickwitz, *Geld und Wirtschaft im röm. Reich* (Helsingfors, 1932), p. 36. A strange confusion appears in T. Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V (published posthumously, 1940). On p. 4 we find the correct indication that in the time of Augustus the pay was 225 denarii per annum. But on p. 56, n. 54, we are told that Domitian raised the stipend from 75 denarii per month (!) to 100; p. 86, n. 51, gives the figures 150 denarii for Augustus and 225 for Tiberius per year. Erroneous also is the statement (p. 93) that Septimius Severus raised it 25 per cent, for the increase was 33½ per cent.

<sup>33</sup> The new reading is accepted by Arangio-Ruiz, *FIRA*, III, 467, n. 3. It was, however, unknown to De Robertis, *I Rapporti di lavoro nel diritto romano* (1946).

<sup>32</sup> Laborerie, *op. cit.*, p. 195, translated it “en bonne monnaie.”

<sup>33</sup> P. 337, n. 18; and, following him, F. M. de Robertis, *La Organizzazione e la tecnica produttiva: Le Forze di lavoro e i salari nel mondo romano* (1946), p. 189.

Egyptian papyri. With one stroke it explains away several doubts which the text has raised. First, the high penalty imposed on the worker for quitting his work against the will of the employer now appears in a new light. If the worker received food from his *conductor* besides the wages in cash, the penalty is not so enormous as it had appeared when it seemed more than three times the total daily wages.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, what had seemed the most striking point in the agreement, the loss of all wages in the case of *vis maior* (inundation), contrary to what we know from some texts of the *Digest*,<sup>37</sup> assumes a new aspect. It is less striking if we understand the text in the sense that, in spite of the temporary cessation of work in the mine, the worker still remains on the spot and receives his food from the employer. Thus both parties share the losses caused by natural accidents. The employer loses the profit from the mine during the critical period and takes care of repairing the damages, but he keeps the worker at his disposal; the latter might even be of some help in removing the obstacles. On the other hand, the worker loses his cash wages in proportion (*pro rata*) if he is idle but receives the allowances *in natura*. The meaning of *pro rata computare debebit* does not admit of any doubt; he must suffer a proportionate deduction from his cash wages corresponding to the time that he does not work at all. The situation is evident; the normal work in the mine must be stopped in the case of inundation until the hindrance is removed, but the workers remain in their lodgings ready to resume their work as soon as possible. The

full or partial deduction of the wages due to him is made with his co-operation (*computare debebit*) in the reckoning, not unilaterally by the employer. It seems to me very probable that for such events as *fluor*,<sup>38</sup> which certainly was not rare in a territory rich in rivers, there were special provisions in the general mining regulations, known to all miners, so that in the case of such an occurrence there was no doubt about their rights and duties. The meaning of the simple and concise locution *pro rata computare* (good Latin!)<sup>39</sup> was, beyond any doubt, clear to all interested persons.

What about the penalty of 5 sesterces per day imposed upon the *conductor* for failure to pay the wages at the time fixed? The *mora conductoris* must be understood only with regard to the wages in cash (*merces per tempora, summa mercedis, mercedem solvendi mora*). In the Roman terminology *merces* in *locatio conductio operarum* consisted only of money.<sup>40</sup> The penalty imposed upon the *conductor* is all a penalty, for, if it was to be paid within the working term, the worker probably continued on the job while waiting for the wages due and continued to receive his food, together with other miners, as before. If the delay came at the end of the contractual period, when the worker was no longer bound to work, the 5 sesterces penalty per day was no less a pure penalty for the overdue wages. But we must remember that the employer's penalty became one in fact only if the delay lasted more than 3 days. In

<sup>36</sup> Not double, as Laborde (op. cit., p. 196) and Arangio-Ruiz (SD, p. 622, n. 74) assume, starting from an erroneous calculation (cf. above, n. 26). The latter observes, moreover, that this is in accordance with "our experience" which is certainly an allusion to the *stipulatio duplæ* in the Roman practice."

<sup>37</sup> Cf. below.

<sup>38</sup> *Fluor* means "inundation." Laborde translates the term by "envahissement progressif de la mine." The passages noted in TLL, VI, 976, are rather in favor of the first meaning.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. above, p. 236.

<sup>40</sup> See C. Longo, *Mélanges Girard*, II (1912), 105 ff.; and Berger, *Kritische Vierteljahresschrift für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft*, 3. Folge, XIV (1914), 114 ff.

Roman juristic language the employer was given 3 days for the so-called *purgatio morae*. This is expressed by the defective phrase *exceptis cessatis tribus* (sc. "diebus").<sup>41</sup> The 3-day period recalls the *triduum* in the *Lex metalli Vipascensis*, l. 9.<sup>42</sup> Through this additional detail the penalty clause loses its severity, since 3 days certainly were adequate for the administrative staff of the mine to fulfil pending obligations.

Our text does not specify what kind of work the laborer had to perform *in opere aurario*. It says only that the services (*operae*) should be *sanae et valentes*. The phrase seems to be a stereotype, since it occurs in all three documents. Although unknown in any other legal document or juristic source, if I am correct, it does not present any difficulties as to meaning: the services had to be performed as those of a healthy man and efficiently. There is no specific provision in the event of the laborer's illness. That was not necessary, because, according to a Roman rule, the worker hired for *operae* may claim payment of wages if the reason for his not doing his work is not chargeable to him, "si per eum non stetit quominus operas praestet" (*Dig. xix. 2. 38 pr.*).<sup>43</sup> Complete physical unfitness of the worker was treated from the same viewpoint. The ordinary task of a worker in a gold mine did not require special knowledge or preparation, so that liability for *imperitia* (*Dig. xix. 2. 9. 5*) did not enter into consideration. We see, indeed, that in tablet

No. XI the worker is hired for any kind of work, *quidquid opus erit*. There is no doubt that the worker of that contract was obliged to work in the case of inundation in removing the damages created by the flood.

All commentators have correctly emphasized that the clause concerning the worker's loss of a proportional part of the wages in cash in the event of a natural catastrophe is contrary to the principle expressed by Paul in the well-known text, *Dig. xix. 2. 38 pr.*: "Qui operas suas locavit, totius temporis mercedem accipere debet, si per eum non stetit quominus praestet." But does this saying exclude the validity of a special agreement between the parties to the effect that, in case of *vis maior*, the worker has to share the loss with the employer in a certain measure? Certainly not. Paul's text does not say anything about such a situation. The very next passage (*ibid.*, sec. 1) states that an advocate does not have to return the honorarium he had received as advance payment if it is not his fault that he did not argue the case. There cannot be any doubt that in the case in question a contrary obligation on his part was not stipulated, since the text would have mentioned it. The rescript of the emperors Severus and Antoninus, referred to by Ulpian in *Dig. xix. 2. 19. 9*, is not less instructive. The emperors decided, in a case in which the *conductor* had died before the time for which he had hired the worker had expired, that, if the laborer is not at fault in failing to render the services agreed upon, he has to be paid for the whole time, provided that he did not take a job with another employer. Thus the rule expressed in *Dig. xix. 2. 38 pr.* is not absolute and unchangeable if it could be put aside by a later event not foreseen by the parties. So much the more could it

<sup>41</sup> So Arangio-Ruiz, *FIRA*, III, 467, n. 6. The explanation given by Carcopino (*op. cit.*, p. 98), that *cessatis* is used here as a noun with the same meaning as *cessationibus*, is not convincing. There is no evidence for the use of *cessatio* in the sense of 1 day of delay. The phrase was still described as *peu claire* in P. F. Girard's *Textes de droit romain* (6th ed., 1928), p. 855.

<sup>42</sup> See Riccobono, *FIRA*, I (2d ed., 1941), 502, No. 105.

<sup>43</sup> See below.

be modified by their special understanding. The *locatio conductio* in Roman law was a contract governed by *bona fides*. Not without reason did the emperors point out in the decision, mentioned above, that "*fidem contractus impleri aequum est*." Special agreements covering *vis maior* were certainly not *contra bonos mores*. Therefore, I believe that in our case, with its specific provision for such an event, a Roman jurist would have followed the *fides contractus* and would not have decided against what had been settled in the contract. There is no reason to assume with De Robertis<sup>44</sup> that the rule established in *Dig. xix. 2. 38 pr., 1* and *19. 9*, was not the law before the issuing of this rescript by the two emperors. Neither of the texts excludes the possibility of a modification of the rule by agreement, and it is simply an accident that, with reference to the *locatio conductio operarum*, the restrictive clause, *nisi contrarium actum sit*, is missing, as we shall show in the final section of our remarks.

The penalty clause imposed upon the worker covers two cases, *recedere* and *cessare*. The first term alludes to the possibility that the worker may quit the job for good, the second to a temporary interruption of the work on his part for any reason. He is liable, however, only when he acts *invito conductore*. Hence we must infer that, if the employer gives his consent, the worker may freely cease working permanently or temporarily. In the first case the labor contract is dissolved by mutual agreement of the parties. The employer, too, has no right to dissolve the agreement unilaterally before its expiration. The worker is protected against such an eventuality by the penalty clause imposed on the employer if he ceases paying the wages. The protection granted the employer against the labor-

er's leaving for good has, however, a weak point. The laborer need not pay the penalty in cash.<sup>45</sup> The daily fine of 5 sesterces will be deducted from his next pay (*numeros de summa mercedis*).<sup>46</sup> Thus the employer's risk is covered only until the end of the next payment term. But if the worker leaves the day after the payday, for instance, and moves into another place, the *conductor* has no practically effective measures beyond the normal *actio conducti*, which in similar cases may have proved quite inefficient. Whether there were administrative coercive remedies, we do not know.

The foregoing analysis of the document and its juristic content may be terminated by the following conclusions:

1. In so far as the administration of gold mines in the second century after Christ is concerned, the labor contracts, *locatio conductio operarum*, concluded with free mineworkers by the imperial administration, either directly or by a private *conductor*—whether a big operator or a small one—acting under its supervision, show several characteristic features that speak favorably of that administration. Upon request the worker could get a written statement of the principal clauses of the agreement, which, as a whole, does not give the impression of abuse of the workers. The penalty clauses indicate an equal treatment of employer and laborer: each is subject to the same penalties. In fact, the protection of the interest of the *conductor* is not without a certain weakness, as we have seen. Both parties share in the losses in the event of a

<sup>44</sup> Thus wrongly Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (1928), p. 101.

<sup>45</sup> For a similar use of *numerare* see *CIL*, IV, 3340, No. V (= *FIRA*, III, No. 128c): "*nummos . . . mercede minus numeratos*." In other texts of the *apocae Pompeianae*, *persolutus* is used instead of *numeratus* (cf. *CIL*, IV, 3340, Nos. XXV, XL (= *FIRA*, III, Nos. 129a, b).

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 148.

temporary suspension of the work because of a natural accident. Annulment of the contract is possible by mutual agreement only. The wages do appear to be rather low, but definite conclusions on this point are not possible. Nor do we know anything about the actual conditions of working.

2. With regard to the juristic content of the contract, the most striking element is the clause concerning the risk to be borne by both parties in case of *vis maior*. The Roman principle of contractual liberty in contracts ruled by *bona fides* finds expression not only in the provision which distributes the risk between the two parties but also in the imposition of a fine upon the socially and financially stronger party, backed by the imperial administration. The picture of the various *negotia* which we have from documentary sources, inscriptions, and papyri shows that by mutual agreement of the parties the typical contractual clauses could be modified and the reciprocal duties and rights settled according to their mutual understanding.

The natural consequence of this approach to the Roman contractual system is the following question. In many texts of Justinian's legislative work, primarily in the *Digest*, why has the suspicion of interpolation been cast on all those *nisi*-clauses in which the normal contractual provisions were declared subject to change by a contrary agreement between the parties? In order to avoid misunderstanding, we want to stress that we do not propose to defend the genuineness of all *nisi*-phrases, for many should be eliminated from the classical texts as spurious beyond any doubt. But in the contractual sphere such restrictive clauses as "*nisi si aliud contrarium convenerit*" or "*nisi aliud specialiter (nominatim) actum sit*,"<sup>47</sup>

and the like, do not deserve the blanket condemnation that has been their lot in the past. It is sufficient to look into the last stereotype *Digest* editions of Paul Krueger to establish the point that nearly all of them are stigmatized as spurious by means of angular brackets.<sup>48</sup> A similar picture is given by the *Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae*, in which the genuineness of many pertinent texts is marked suspect by the indication "*Trib.?*" The general assault against those texts was conducted some sixty years ago by F. Eisele,<sup>49</sup> with heavy ammunition, though sometimes with banal and insignificant comments, such as "self-evident," "superfluous," etc.<sup>50</sup> A thorough re-examination of the pertinent texts, primarily in the contractual domain, seems to me necessary. It would, I am sure, save a good many texts from the purge that they have suffered. Formal, merely grammatical or syntactical inaccuracies, an incorrect indicative or a false subjunctive, do not weigh much. Nor should one be deterred by the list of authors mentioned in the *Index interpolationum* in favor of an interpolation. Fortunately, we are not bound in this regard by a "law of citations."<sup>51</sup> The decisive question is: Did the classical Roman law admit of contractual clauses which changed the normal, typical rules of a specific contractual type into the contrary, or did it not? Are those restrictive phrases, most often introduced

<sup>47</sup> Many of these texts are to be found in Heumann-Seckel, *op. cit.*, s.v. "*nisi*." See also *VIR*, s.vv. "*contrarius*," I, 1005. 20 ff.; "*nisi*," IV, 144 ff.; "*nominatim*," IV, 202. 28 ff., 38 ff.; "*specialiter*," V, 643. 23 ff., 644. 10 ff. For pertinent literature see A. Guarneri-Citati, *Indice delle parole e costrutti ritenuti indizio dell'interpolazione* (1927), s.vv. "*agere*," "*convenire*," "*nisi*."

<sup>48</sup> *Zeitschr. Savigny-Stift.*, X (1889), 296 ff.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 300 (two texts), 302, 307, 308, 309, 310, 314, 315, etc.; and XIII (1892), 151, 152 (two texts; "No proof for the interpolation is necessary").

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Berger, *Zeitschr. für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, LI (1936), 186 ff.

<sup>47</sup> On *nominatim* see M. F. Lepri, *Studi Ferrini*, II (Milan, 1947), 107 f.

with *nisi*, substantial changes of the classical law originating in Justinian or pre-Justinian law, or are they nothing more than formal alterations which retain the classical law without bringing into it anything new?

The study of this problem lies beyond the limits of these remarks. We may, however, be permitted to quote one text only, *Dig. xix. 2. 36* (Florentinus, *libro VII Institutionum*) in which, with regard to a particular case of *locatio conductio operis faciendi*, the jurist discusses the question of who bears the risk if the work (*opus*) accomplished happens to be destroyed before its approval by the person who ordered it. We read: "Si tamen vi maiore

opus prius interciderit quam adprobaretur, locatoris periculo est, nisi si aliud actum sit." The last phrase is held by eminent scholars to be interpolated.<sup>52</sup> The best argument in reply is our Dacian labor contract, a classical instance of a transaction in which, with full validity, *aliud actum est*.<sup>53</sup>

ÉCOLE LIBRE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES  
NEW YORK

<sup>52</sup> See *Index interpolationum*, I (1929), 363, and, from recent publications, Luzzatto, *Caso fortuito e forza maggiore come limite della responsabilità contrattuale* (1938), p. 197; De Robertis, *op. cit.*, in n. 31, pp. 161, 169, 172.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *Dig. xix. 2. 13. 5*: "nisi periculum quoque in se artifex receperat." See *Index interpolationum*, I, 357; Luzzatto, *op. cit.*, p. 191, n. 2. The genuineness of this text is not examined by De Robertis, *op. cit.*

# ON THE NOMINAL ENDINGS -is, -iv, IN LATER GREEK

DEMETRIUS JOHN GEORGACAS

THE purpose of the present paper\* is to scrutinize in its entirety a problem still open after more than a century of study—the problem of the origin of the nominal endings sg. masc. nom. -is, acc. -iv, neut. nom. acc. -iv, occurring in Greek from the Hellenistic period from the earlier forms -ios and -iov, and to give a unified explanation of the phenomenon in both cases.

For the first time, in the Hellenistic era from ca. 258 B.C., there appear in the Koine on papyri and inscriptions the nominal endings: -is masc. nom. sg., -iv acc. sg., -i voc. (beside gen. -iov or -i,<sup>1</sup> dat. -iv) and -iv neut. sg. nom., acc. (beside gen. -iov, dat. -iv) for earlier masc. -ios, -iov, neut. -iov, of the o-stems. These shortened endings have continued through the medieval linguistic period to Modern Greek:<sup>2</sup> -is, -iv (the final nasal -v is dialectal now, -i is standard Modern Greek);<sup>3</sup>

and they embrace some thousands of nouns. The earliest occurrence concerns a neuter substantive. The oldest papyrus

\* The final v may possibly have become silent as early as in "vulgar" Attic, as is shown in vase inscriptions (P. Kretschmer, "Ueber den Dialekt der attischen Vasenschriften," *KZ*, XXIX [1888], 452 f.); but the leaving-out of v in these inscriptions can have had another cause, i.e., purposeful abbreviating. Mention should also be made of twenty-two forms employed by foreigners in Aristophanes' *Aves*, *Acharnenses*, and especially *Thesmophoriazusaí*, such as *δύσκολ'* for *δύσκολο* from *δύσκολον*, *πανούργο*, *στρίππο*, *ψάλλο*, *γρόδιο*, *κόδιο*, *τιτρί(ο)*, etc.; see J. Friedrich, "Das Attische im Munde von Ausländern bei Aristophanes," *Philologus*, LXXV (1918), 285 f. Friedrich assumes that Aristophanes there reproduces a feature of the popular language in Athens, imitating the native popular Attic language after real observation (see *ibid.*, pp. 286, 300 f.). Kretschmer, who had previously mentioned such instances from Aristophanes (*op. cit.*, p. 452), approves Friedrich's point of view (P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XII [1923], 181), which is actually possible. These forms may, however, not have been popular Attic, since we do not certainly have any such forms pronounced by a native speaker in Aristophanes, so that we cannot attribute them without doubt to the actual spoken language of Athens. As Friedrich himself remarks, Aristophanes uses the v in other cases of foreigners' speech (fourteen nominal and three pronominal forms). If this reasoning is correct, the forms without the final v would be due to the phonologic habits in the foreign tongue of these immigrant speakers.

If this is so, the oldest occurrences of this silence are found in two dialectal (Pamphylian) inscriptions of Aspendus (*GDI*, 1260, 1261) with *δρεμνι* (for *δρεμνιον*) and *πύργο* (for *πύργον*) (cf. P. Kretschmer, "Zum pamphyliischen Dialekt," *KZ*, XXXIII [1895], 266 [also *φανάζω*, *ibid.*, No. 55; *Μαρίω*, *ibid.*, No. 75; *ἐγερόμῃ*, *ibid.*, No. 56]; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, V [1914], 279 f., and XXII [1934], 224). From the third/second century B.C. the final v was often omitted in Egyptian papyri (cf. K. Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* [Leipzig, 1898], pp. 89 f.; Fr. Völcker, *Papyrorum Graecarum syntaxis specimen* [Bonn, 1900], pp. 31 ff.; A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* [Strassburg, 1901], p. 173 with n. 7; and, above all, Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, 191–94. The final v has been preserved in the modern Greek dialects only in those of Asia Minor (Pontus, Cappadocia) and in the south-eastern Greek islands: in Cyprus, Dodecanesus, Icarus, etc., and is lacking in the western modern Greek dialects, this lack being an inheritance from the later Koine, when (in the sixth or seventh century of our era) final v was dropped in absolutely final position in the western dialects. Forms such as *ἀνέμρι*, *ἐλάδι*, *θειάφι*, *οἰνάρι*, *ὄσπρι*, *περιστήρι*, *πωγάρι*, etc., which occur in Egyptian papyri of the fifth/sixth century of our era (*P. Paris*, 4 bis), are Modern Greek in the form of their ending (cf. A. Jannaris,

\* Dedicated to the memory of my teacher, Eduard Schwyzer (died May 3, 1943).

<sup>1</sup> In Modern Greek the gen. sg. masc. to -is is -i, as in the scheme *ταμάς*:*ταμία*, *Εύχάρης*:*Εύχρη*, etc., in Hellenistic Greek, i.e., "genitive = nominative minus -s" (cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I [Munich, 1938], 561). In some instances, however, -iov from earlier -lov still remains: *Μαροῦ*, *Μαρτιοῦ*, *ῥ' αἰ* *Δημητριοῦ*, *ῥ' αἰ* *Βασίλειοῦ*, etc.; and in analogical accordance with this *ῥ' αἰ* *Γιαννιοῦ* (nom. sg. *αἰ* *Γιάννης* = *ἄγιος* *Γιάννης*) is also formed.

As to the voc. sg., there are instances in -i: *Ἄλλε*, *Ἀπολλώνε*, *Ἀφροδίτε*, *Γυμνάσι*, *Δημήτρι*, *Διονύσι*, *Εὐγένε*, *Ἡμέρι*, *Κακίδε*, *Κρίσι*, *Πηγάσι*, *Πισίδε*, *Τερετί* (see below, p. 250; cf. also A. Wilhelm, "Εὐτίχει, Εὐγένε," *Wiener Studien*, XXIV [1902], 596–600.) This vocative in -i is also analogical, i.e., the nominative minus the nominative sign -s. On the nominative in -is starting, conversely, from the voc. in -e plus the nominative sign -s see below, p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently through inadvertence, E. Mayser (*Grammatik der griechischen Papyri*, I [1906], 260, n. 2, and I<sup>2</sup>, Teil 2 [1938], 16, n. 1) says that formations in -is, -iv do not occur in Modern Greek. Nor is it right that in instances from papyri there are also adjectives ending in -is, -iv (*ibid.*, p. 16, l. 1); e.g., *ἡμιόλιον* (sc. *μέρος*) was, to be sure, an adjective, but this, as well as the feminine *ἡμιόλια* (sc. *μοῖρα*), had become substantive before this period.

examples of this phenomenon, which is commonly known as a vowel "syncope," follow:

ἡμιοβέλιον, "half an obol," on coins from Aegium (146–143 B.C.), otherwise ἡμιωβόλιον, ἡμιωβέλιον (240 B.C.)

ἡμιόλιν, "half as much again, one and a half," on a papyrus of 258 B.C. (this being the earliest example known to us), instead of ἡμιόλινον

(δόνυχιν, "nail," 251–250 B.C., is not entirely sure)

ἀργύριν, "silver coin, money," early Ptolemaic

ἐγκοιμήτρην, "counterpane, pall," 163–160 B.C.

ἐκφόριον, "payment on produce, tithe," beside ἐκφόριον (both 118 B.C.)

ἐπιστόλιν, "letter," ca. 100 B.C.

ἀρτοκόπιν, "bakehouse," 97–96 B.C.

ποτήριν, "drinking cup," 97 or 64 B.C.

πιττάκιν, "written message, promissory note," first century B.C.

στρουθίν, "(little) sparrow," first century B.C.

Νουμήνιν, 28 B.C.

Ἀπολλώνις, 160–159 B.C., beside Ἀπολλώνιος

Ἀμμωνάριν, third century B.C.

Πτολεμαῖς, 163 B.C., 117 B.C. (otherwise Πτολεμαῖος, also 117 B.C.)

Θοτοραῖς, 250–249 and 114 B.C.<sup>4</sup>

Βαρβολομαῖς

Εἰρηναῖς, second century A.D.<sup>5</sup>

An *Historical Greek Grammar* [London, 1897], p. 543). And in the ninth century there occurs Τροκανιστήρι in Theophanes' *Chronographia* 445. 6 (cf. P. S. Costas, *An Outline of the History of the Greek Language* [Chicago, 1936], p. 69, n. 4). The older explanation, that the frequency of writings without final *ν* in vase and other inscriptions, in papyri, etc., proves a weak pronunciation of the final *-ν* (so G. Meyer, *Griechische Grammatik*<sup>3</sup> [Leipzig, 1896], p. 399; Kretschmer, *KZ*, XXIX, 452; Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, 191 and 193, n. 2) can, I think, mean that either the *-ν* was voiceless or it disappeared, leaving nasalization in the preceding vowel, certainly with the exception of the cases in which *-ν* was preserved before such consonants as *κ*, *τ*, etc., and often assimilated (on assimilations cf. Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, 229–32) or before vowels in close contact, e.g. τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὴν ἄλλην (τὸν, τὴν, τῶν have preserved the final nasal; the noun has lost it). The best explanation, however, is that of G. Hatzidakis, i.e., that assimilation of the final *ν* (in the article and other monosyllabic subordinate words, such as *ὅν*, *ὅν*, *ὅν*, *μὲν*, etc., preceding noun, verb, etc.), to the following initial consonant of the next word, as in τὸν λόγον, ἐπὶ τῷ φῶτι, ἐν μὲν, ἐν μὲν, ἐν μὲν, etc. (cf., for references, Costas, *op. cit.*, p. 60, n. 2), gave ground for the analogical absence of *-ν* in other cases also (Σύντομος ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης [Athens, 1915], p. 90) and that the assimilation in *ν* + spirant > spirant + spirant, in phrases such as τὸ θεόν, τὸν φίλον, μικρὸν ἔωρον, οὐδὲν θέλει, τῶν χωρῶν, etc., beginning in the fourth century B.C., has been preserved only in the southeastern dialects of Icarus, Dodecanesus, and Cyprus versus the simplified forms τὸ θεό, τὸ φίλο, μικρὸν ἔωρο, ἔλ θέλει, τῶν χωρῶν (s), etc., of the common Modern Greek of today (see G. Hatzidakis, *Ἑπιστημονικὴ Ἑκκέρσις* [of the University of Salonica], I [1927], 4 ff.). Somewhat parallel is the dropping of the final *ν*, a characteristic of Romance languages (cf. V. Pisan, "Innovazioni fonetiche e morfologiche comuni al greco e al romano," *Atti del V Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini*, 1936 [Rome, 1939], pp. 529–33).

<sup>4</sup>Θοτοραῖς is accented Θοτοραῖς by Preisigke (*Namenbuch*, s.v.), Θοτοραῖς and Πτολεμαῖς are accented -αῖς by Mayser (*op. cit.*, I, 260 and I<sup>2</sup>, Tell 2, 16) and others to show that -αῖ- was pronounced as a diphthong; that is not correct (see below, p. 256). Πτολεμαῖς occurs in the year 165/64 B.C. (U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, I [Berlin and Leipzig, 1927], 190, n. 18, ll. 19 and 29; cf. *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale et autres bibliothèques*, Vol. XVIII, Part II: *Papyrus grecs du Louvre et de la bibliothèque impériale*, Pl. XXVI, 23r; cf. the writing Πτολεμαῖον on an ostrakon (P. Viereck, *Griechische und griechisch-demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg in Elsass*, I [Berlin, 1923], 267, No. 776, ll. 10–11). The form Βαρβολομαῖος occurs in a papyrus (F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, I [Berlin and Leipzig, 1915], 452, No. 4887.2) and Βαρβολομαῖ in another of later date, after the year A.D. 716 (H. Bell [ed.], *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, IV [1910], 200, 220, No. 1419, ll. 645 and 1160). Θοτοραῖος and gen. Θοτοραῖω are found (*The Flinders Petrie Papyri*, ed. Mahaffy and Smyly, III [1905], Nos. 99, 15, and 71.19; 90aIII.25; 99.14; 100b.5; 107e.25, 27, 31, 36) beside Θοτοραῖς in a papyrus of 250/49 B.C. (*Papyri greci e latini*, IV [Firenze, 1917], 96, No. 366, l. 2: Περὶ καὶ Θοτοραῖς βοῶν ἐφεδόμενοι); but there occur also Θοτοραῖς Φαμήσιος (99/98 B.C., Johnson, Martin, and Hunt, *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library* [Manchester, 1915], II, 72, 65) and a dative Θοτοραῖς σιτολόγῳ in the middle of the third century B.C. (G. Plaumann, "Einige Ostraka der Berliner Papyrussammlung," *Achie f. Papyrusforsch.*, VI [1920], 220, No. 8), in which the value αῖ(=ε) is doubtful. Cf. also the fem. Θοτοραῖς, -αῖος, -αῖν of the third century B.C. (J. Lesquier, *Papyrus de Magdola* [Paris, 1912], No. 42, 6, 1, 9, and 15).

<sup>5</sup>For examples from the papyri cf. Mayser, *ibid.*; on the proper names cf. Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, s.v.; so for personal name examples from the first centuries of our era in *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection*, ed. L. Amundsen, I (Ann Arbor, 1935), *passim*.

The bulk of the examples from the papyri belong to the second to first centuries B.C.

There occur also Latin words in Greek papyri, such as *ἐξονπλάριν* (third century), *exemplar*; *λωδίκιν* (third century) beside *λωδίκιον* (Byzant.), "(small) *lodix*"; *συνψελειν*, *subsellium*; *τρουλιν* (third century); *φιβλατόριν* (third century), *fibulatorium*, etc.; *διπλοκάρις*; *καλοπτάρις*, *collectarius*; *λογιωνάρις*, *legionarius*; *λειβλάρεις*, *librarius*; and personal names: *Αἴλις*, *Ἀμάτις* beside *Ἀμάτιος* (*Amatus*?); *Ἀνήσις* beside *Ἀνήσιος* (*Anisius*?); *Ἀντώνις*; *Ἀρρις* beside frequent *Ἀρριος*; *Ἀτίλις* (and *Ἀτείλις*) beside *Ἀτίλιος* (*Atilius*); *Αὐρήλις* beside *Αὐρήλιος* (*Aurelius*); *Ἰούλις* beside frequent *Ἰούλιος* (*Iulius*); *Καικιλλίς* beside *Καικιλλίος* (*Caecilius*); *Λούκις* beside *Λούκιος* (*Lucius*); *Οὐαλέρις* beside frequent *Οὐαλέριος* (*Valerius*); *Παπίρις* beside *Παπίριος* (*Papirius*); *Πετρώνις* beside *Πετρώνιος* (*Petronius*); *Πόρκις* beside *Πούρκιος* (*Porcius*); *Σερεονίλις* beside *Σερεονίλιος*, *Σερονίλιος* (*Servilius*); *Φέστις* beside *Φέστιος* (*Festius*); *Φλαουίς* (on an ostrakon) beside *Φλαουίος* and *Φλαβίος* (*Flavius*). All these personal names belong to the first, second, and following centuries of our era.<sup>6</sup>

Likewise, there are found on inscriptions from the first century of our era such words as *κουβούκλιν*, *μεμουρίν*, *παλουμβάριν*, *πραιμπειλάριν*, *τρειούνκιν*, *δρακωνάρις*, *δρομεδάρις*, *λανκιάρις*, *δρεάρις*, *πατρίκις*, *ράδις*, *ρητιάρις*, *σαγιττάρις*, *σταβλάρις*, *φρουμεντάρις*, *χαρτάρις*, etc.; *Ἰανουάρις*, *Ἰούλις*, *Ἰούνις*; personal names: *Σπέδις* (A.D. 60), *Δομίτις* (84), *Καρβείλις* (98), *Πόπλις* (116), *Φούρις* (around 155), *Φάβιν*

(157-58), *Λούκις* (177), *Ἀκίλις*, *Αἴλις* (and *Ἐλεις*), *Ἀντέλις*, *Ἀντώνις*, *Ἀνίκις*, *Ἀπφιν* (*Appium*), *Αὐρήλις*, *Βονιφάτις*, *Γάις* and *Γάβις*, *Καλπούρνις* (and *-όρνις*), *Καρωνέντις*, *Κάσσις*, *Κλαύδις*, *Κλῶδις*, *Κωστάντις*, *Κορνήλις*, *Ἰγνάτις* (and *Ἐγνάτις*), *Λαυρέντις*, *Λικίννιν*, *Λουκρήτις*, *Μάρις*, *Μετρίκις*, *Νασίδις*, *Ὀκτάβις*, *Πακῶνις*, *Πεσκέννις*, *Πετρώνις* (and *Πετρώνεις*), *Πλώτις*, *Πομπώνις*, *Ῥωμούλις*, *Ῥώσκις*, *Σαβούκις*, *Σεμπρώνις*, *Σινπλίκις*, *Σόσσις*, *Εἰσταβλάρις* (*Stabularius*), *Τέρτις*, *Τιβέρις*, *Οὐλπις*, *Οὐαλέρις* and *Βαλέρις*, *Βενέρις*, *Φλάβις*, *Φορτούνις*, etc., all from the first three centuries of our era.<sup>7</sup>

On Greek inscriptions of Lycia the following nouns have been preserved: *κύριν*, "lord, master, etc." (and the personal name *Φιλοκύρις*); *δρεάριν* or *δριάριν* (Lat. *horrearium*); *βενεφικιάρις*; *ἐξέδριν*; *σόριν* (for *σόριον*, dimin. of *σορός*); *γραμματίιν* (dimin. of *γράμμα*, "written character, letter"); and personal names: *Βόθις*, *Δημήτρις*, *Αὐρήλις*, *Ποπίλλις*, *Τόλλις*.<sup>8</sup>

On inscriptions of Lydia there are found forms such as *σύμβις* (masc., Attaleia, third century of our era, and fem., Kjömürdj, 198-99),<sup>9</sup> and *σύνβις* (fem., Gürdije, 529-30)<sup>10</sup> beside *τὴν σύμβιον* (141-42, *συμβία* fourth century A.D.), *φυλακτήριν* neut. (95 or, at the latest, 149),<sup>11</sup> and a considerable number of names: *Ἀλικῶνις* (120-21), *Ἀμμις* nom. sg., *Ἀμμιν* acc. sg. neut. as a woman's name (108-9), and *Ἀμιν ἡ θυγάτηρ* (202 or

<sup>7</sup> See the list in T. Eckinger, *Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griechischen Inschriften* (München, 1892), p. 56. The material known by 1870 was put together by F. G. Benseler, "De nominibus propriis et Latinis in is pro ius et Graecis in is u pro ias ior terminatis," *Curtius Studien*, III (1870), 153-55, 156, 167, 169-83.

<sup>8</sup> K. Hauser, *Grammatik der griechischen Inschriften Lykiens* (Basel, 1916), p. 80.

<sup>9</sup> J. Keil and A. von Premerstein, "Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien ausgeführt 1908," *Denkschriften d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, LIV (1911), 2. Abh., pp. 64a, 72 f., Nos. 132, 152.

<sup>10</sup> W. H. Buckler, "Lydian Records," *JHS*, XXXVII (1917), 108, No. 20; cf. P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XI (1920), 97.

<sup>11</sup> K. Buresch, *Aus Lydien: Epigraphisch-geographische Reiseberichte* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 84.

<sup>6</sup> B. Meinersmann, *Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri* (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 113 ff. L. R. Palmer (*A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri*, I, Part I [London, 1945], 31 ff.), treating the suffixes *-ios* and *-ion* does not give any examples with the suffix forms *-is* and *-iv*. The numerous Latin borrowings in *-is*, too, appear in Greek with the suffix *-ios*: *Ἀνουάλιος*, *αἰγυστάλιος*, *κουντουβερνάλιος*, etc. (cf. *ibid.*, p. 31).

148), "Αμμιν ἡ μήτηρ (206-7), for "Αμμιος, "Αμμιον, Αὔξεντις for Αὔξεντιος, Δημήτρις ὁ πατήρ (227-28), Διονύσις (206-7), "Ελλάδης, Λεύκις (end of the second or beginning of the third century), Δούκις Μάρκου (231 or 177), Μόσχειν ἡ ἀδελφή (227-28) beside Μόσχιον τὴν ἀδελφήν, Πόπλειν τὸν υἱόν beside Πόπλιον, Χρυσείν nom. sg. (a woman's name), "Ιούλις, Τιβερίς.<sup>12</sup>

On coins from Asia Minor -εις appears for -ις: Ζεὺς "Ασεις (from the Phrygian city of Laodicea), Μητρόβεις (Ephesus under Augustus) for Μητρόβιος, γραμματεὺς "Αριστέας "Αγρεις (Ephesus), Κάρρεις (Stratonicea in Caria) from \*Κάρριος, Πολεμαῖος Κεράσεις (Sardes).<sup>13</sup>

On an ostrakon, probably Ptolemaic, there occur: συνφέλειν (which is not to be emended with Goodspeed to -ιον) and κελαρίδιν (-λλ-; -ιδιον, which Goodspeed proposed, is also unnecessary).<sup>14</sup> On a grave inscription Διονύσις (169) is found, and on another Σπέδης (206);<sup>15</sup> λατόμιν on two grave inscriptions of Pontic Heraclea (BCH, XIII, 316 ff.), σταδιν (IGSI, 1108), μελίτιν (second century IGSI, 1890), πανκράτιν (CIG, add. 2810b); πανκράτειν on a Lesbian inscription (BCH, IV, 447); σόριν (CIG, add. 4316k); "Επικτάριν on an inscription of Cyprus (BCH, XX, 343); Ποσιδώνις on a decree of honors from Milesian Branchidae (first century B.C.);<sup>16</sup> "Αφροδίσις on an inscription from Larisa (Athen. Mitt., XI, 56, No. 35) and Φορδίσις (Pamphylia),

Μακάρις -ιν (CIG, 8863, 6274), Φιλάβεις Λονγείνος in an inscription from Durazzo in Albania.<sup>17</sup>

In land-register inscriptions of Thera there occur neuter names of fields in -ιν: "Αποψίδιν, "Ανεμοψάλιν, Τοπάριν (beside Τοπάριον), Ουράμβιν, Χρυσελάδιν, Ποσιδάριν, Δισκόντιν, Φοινίκιν (IG, XII, Part 3, 343-45, 349) beside others ending in -ιον.

The shortened form -ιν is shown also in such common names of women as "Ακάκιν (CIG, 7326, 7361f), "Ακέσιν, Τάτειν (Athen. Mitt., XXII, 47, No. 28) beside Τατάριον, Βεβία "Απφειν, and "Αφφειν (CIG, 3278, 3167), Τατάριν (Tralleis, beginning of the third century, *ibid.*, 3954) beside Τατάριον, Τρυφέριν, and Εἰκόνιν (Athen. Mitt., VIII, 336, No. 17), "Αφροδίειν (Thessaly, IG, IX, Part 2, 320), Καλλίστιν (Coreyra, IG, IX, Part 1, 914), "Ελευθέρην (CIA, III, 2651), Φιλημάτιν (CIA, III, 156, 2122), Μακάριν (IGI, 1474), etc.<sup>18</sup>

From the imperial age there occur in Pergamene inscriptions: "Ελευθέρην, παιδείν (-ειν = -ιν); Κνίδιν six times beside Κνίδιον (105 times).<sup>19</sup> In Magnesian inscriptions occur the place names Βάβειν (fourth century of our era) and Βάριν (beside others ending in -ιον).<sup>20</sup>

The spelling -ειν ("Αγρεις beside acc. \*"Αγρειν, Βάβειν, παιδείν, συνφέλειν, etc.) may prove the length ι, i.e., -ιν,<sup>21</sup> as in

<sup>12</sup> C. Praschniker and A. Schober, *Archäologische Forschungen in Albanien und Montenegro* (Vienna, 1919), p. 45; cf. P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XIV (1925), 203.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Buresch, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

<sup>14</sup> E. Schwyzler (at that time "Schweizer"), *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 73, 143 f.

<sup>15</sup> E. Nachmanson, *Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften* (Uppsala, 1903), p. 125.

<sup>16</sup> Schwyzler (*Gramm. d. pergamen. Inschr.*, pp. 73 f. and *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 472) and Kretschmer (*Glotta*, X [1920], 227) called our attention to this. The length, however, cannot be affected only by the expiratory accent, because "Αγρειν, Βάβειν, and συνφέλειν have unaccented α; about the somewhat longer duration of the expiratory accented vowels cf. Kretschmer, *KZ*, XXX (1891), 598 f.; Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, 140 f.

<sup>17</sup> J. Kell and A. von Premerstein, "Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien und der südlichen Aiolis ausgeführt 1906," *Denkschriften d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, LIII (1910), 2. Abh., Nos. 23, 140, 141, 158, 191; *ibid.*, LIV, 2. Abh., Nos. 103, 122, 134, 135, 138, 139; Buresch, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, 73.

<sup>18</sup> R. Münsterberg, "Grammatisches aus griechischen Münzen," *Numismat. Zeitschr.*, N.F., VIII (1915), 117; cf. P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, X (1920), 227.

<sup>19</sup> E. Goodspeed, "Greek Documents in the Museum of the New York Historical Society," *Mélanges J. Nicole* (Geneva, 1905), p. 184.

<sup>20</sup> Kästner, *De aeris, quae ab imperio Caesaris Octavianus constituto initium duxerint* (Lipsiae, 1890), pp. 52 (No. 5), 57 (No. 7).

<sup>21</sup> G. Hirschfeld, "Ancient Greek Inscriptions," *Brit. Mus.*, IV, 1, No. DCCCCXXV.

Pergamene ὑμείν, παραγεινέσθωσαν, etc., in Latin borrowings, such as σκρείβας, Σκρειβόνιος, Ἀντωνέινος, Κρείσπος, Λογγεῖνος, Μαξιμείνος, etc.,<sup>22</sup> but it also represents short *i* because of the neglect of quantity in Pergamene Εἰάσων (Ἰάσων), Νεικηφορείων, etc., in Ἀπολλινάρειος, Ἀτείλιος, Δύρηλιος, Γάειος, Δέκειος, Ἰούλειος, Λούκειος, Παπείρεις, Φλάουειος, κοστωδεῖα (22 B.C.), etc.

In the Greek mother-country neuter -*u* occurs in Attic inscriptions from the imperial age: ἀμφιδέξιν, παγκράτιν, στάδιν, κνηστρίν.<sup>23</sup> The instances become innumerable in Christian and Byzantine times. In those instances of later date it is no longer a question of the coexistence of the forms -*ios* and -*is*, -*ion* and -*u* but one of taking over and spreading the forms in -*is*, -*u*, whose development had generally been completed in the spoken language as early as pre-Christian times; -*is*, -*u* have since existed in the living popular language, whereas -*ios*, -*ion* have survived only in scholastic and bookish language. The forms -*is*, -*u* are also medieval and Modern Greek, as they were inherited from the Hellenistic era; they may, therefore, not be stamped as peculiarly medieval.<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand, the change of *eo* to *io* and later of *io* to *i* is known in Laconian; so σίν (*GDI*, 4445.55 = *IG*, V, 211.55) for σίων (θεόν), and in compounds σιφόρος (θεοφόρος), proper names, such as Σίδαμος (*BSA*, XIV, 75) (Θεόδημος), Σιδέκτας (*GDI*, 4440, 4441, 4446) (Attic Θεοδέκτης), Σιμήδης (*ibid.*, 4488) (Θεομήδης), Σιτόμπου (*ibid.*, 4445), Σιχάρης

(*ibid.*), Σικλῆς, Σίτιμος.<sup>25</sup> Also the word \*καθηρατόριον, "hunt," for an athletic contest at Sparta, occurs in Laconian inscriptions of the first to second centuries of our era in such forms as: καθηρατόριον (with -*ion*) (*IG*, V, 288), καθηρατόριον (*BSA*, XIV, 77), [κ]αθηρατόριον (*IG*, V, 274), καθηρατόριον (*BSA*, XIV, 82 = *IG*, V, 296), κασηρατόριον (*BSA*, XII, 366 = *IG*, V, 279; *BSA*, XIII, 185; *GDI*, 4499 = *IG*, V, 305; *GDI*, 4498 = *IG*, V, 301). The form in -*eu* is due not to ignorance<sup>26</sup> but rather to the necessity of representing -*u*.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, there occur personal names, such as: Ἀριστοκράτηρ gen. sg. (*BSA*, XVI, 54 = *IG*, V, 653a,<sup>28</sup> end of the second century) for Ἀριστοκράτιος, Ἀριστοτέληρ, gen. sg. (*BSA*, XII, 365 = *IG*, V, 286; time of Hadrian),<sup>29</sup> Ὀνασικράτηρ (*BSA*, XIII, 187 = *IG*, V, 306) for -*τιος* from -*τεος* (time of Marcus Aurelius); Καλλικράτις (*IG*, V, 881),<sup>30</sup> Τιμάριον (*GDI*, 4586) (for Τιμάριον), Φιλάρην (*BSA*, XXIV, 139; a woman's name in

<sup>22</sup> Cf. P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, I (1909), 354; II (1909-10), 325; IV (1913), 321. The simple σίν for σίων (θεόν) by analogy of the compounds with σι- (σιφόρος, Σικλῆς, etc.) (A. Thumb, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* [Heidelberg, 1909], p. 88, n. 1 [2d ed., 1932, p. 90, n. 1]; cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 472). Names with θεο- (and νεο-) are either preserved in this form of the first part of the compound (Θεόγνητος, Θεόδοτος, Θεόδωρος [and Θεοδᾶς], Θεόμαχος, Θεόξενος, Lat. *Theophilus*, etc.), or have lost the -ο- (Τεφίλου on coins from Durazzo, Θερίλεος, Doric Θίγαιτος, Θίλωρος, Θίμαστος, Θίτιμος, Θίδουλος, Lat. *Thedotus*, *Theodorus*, *Taedosius*, *Tephane*, Sicil. Νεμήτιος, Νεπτόλεμος), or θεο- appears as θο-, e.g., Θοκλείδας, Θοκλήνης, Θοφάνης (cf. W. Schulze, "Posphorus," *KZ*, XXXIII [1895], 393 and n. 2 = *Kleine Schriften* [Göttingen, 1934], 430 and n. 4, 690). In the latter forms assimilation of *eo* to *io* and finally to short *o* (without lengthening) is apparent.

<sup>23</sup> So A. M. Woodward, *BSA*, XIV, 83, n. 1.

<sup>24</sup> Kretschmer, *Glotta*, IV, 321; É. Bourguet, *Le Dialecte laconien* (Paris, 1927), pp. 109, 88.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, IV, 320.

<sup>26</sup> Kretschmer (*ibid.*, II, 325; IV, 321) explains -τέληρ (pronounced -τέλιρ) from -τέλιος with the change of -*eo* to -*io*- (cf. Bourguet, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 36 and n. 2, 140).

<sup>27</sup> Not to be restored with Kolbe to Καλλικράτιος (cf. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, I, 354; Schwyzler, "Die junglaconischen Genitive auf ηρ," *Ἀφύκωμα εἰς Γ. Ν. Χατζιδάκις* [Athens, 1921], p. 88; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 109, n. 4).

<sup>22</sup> See Meinersmann, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

<sup>23</sup> K. Meisterhans (-E. Schwyzler), *Gramm. d. attischen Inschriften*<sup>3</sup> (Berlin, 1900), p. 74, § 27, I, 4, with n. 646.

<sup>24</sup> Thus G. Hatzidakis, in *Ἑλληνικαὶ Ἑρασιεῖαι Βοηαιῶν Σπουδῶν*, VII (1930), 229. For the idioms (subdialects) there is in most cases substitution of the old forms by new ones coming from neighboring idioms (cf. A. Sommerfelt, *Actes du 4<sup>ème</sup> congrès internat. de linguistes à Copenhague, 1936* [Copenhagen, 1938], p. 47).

neuter form); acc. sg. *Αὐρήλην* (*BSA*, XVI, 54 = *IG*, V, 653a; end of the second century); nom. sg. *Ἰούλιρ* (*IG*, V, 294), *Πόπληρ* (*BSA*, XIV, 89, No. 85 = *IG*, V, 312; around 200 of our era) from the Koine form *Πόπλις* (and this from *Πόπλιος*).<sup>31</sup>

In the language of the letters of the kings of the Hellenistic period (of the last three centuries B.C.), since it was the cultured speech of the educated class, there are found forms in *-ιον* neut. only, not in *-ιν*.<sup>32</sup>

As Modern Greek can give us considerable help in the consideration of phenomena of the Koine and generally of later Greek, it must be considered for our problem, too. It really exhibits, on the whole, the facts of the endings *-is*, *-ιν*, *-ιν*, which are already attested for Hellenistic Greek.

The *-ο-* (in *-ιον*) has been retained, however, in a number of cases. "Die Schwierigkeit besteht hier bekanntlich darin, dass dieser Wandel nur in einem Teil der Fälle eingetreten, in einem andern Teil unterblieben ist (z.B. *ἡλιος*, *πλούσιος*, *χωρὸς* = *χωρὶον*)," says P. Kretschmer.<sup>33</sup> Thus *-ο-* has been preserved in a number of Modern Greek neuters, as G. Hatzidakis has observed.<sup>34</sup> This is explainable. Most of the instances can probably be ascribed to literary Atticism and to the church language. Thus the following substantives belong to the language of educated people: *βιβλίον*, *ἐγκώμιον*, *ἐμπόριον*, *συμβούλιον*, *κτήριον* (the latter rather to the church language: from *ἐκτῆριος οἶκος*), etc. To the church language belong the

following: *ἀπολυτικίον*, *εὐαγγέλιον*, *κοντάκιον*, *κρανίον*, *τριψίδιον* (beside *τριψίδι*), *τροπάριον* (beside *τροπάρι*). Learned nouns from the written language have penetrated common Modern Greek, such as *γυμνάσιον*, *δικαστήριον*, *λογιστήριον*, *πανεπιστήμιον* (also in *-εῖον*, such as *γραφεῖον*, *ὕπουργεῖον*; and *πλοῖον*), etc.

But the masculines in *-ιός*, which Hatzidakis<sup>35</sup> mentions, such as *κολιός*, *ξιφιός*, *σκορπιός*, *χοχλιός*, are not to be understood as exceptions to the phenomenon; *κοχλιός*—*χοχλιός* is from ancient *κοχλίας*, *ξιφιός*—*ξιφιός* from *ξιφίας*, and *κολιός* from *κολίας* have been adapted to the second declension in *-ος* by analogy; *σκορπιός* came from *σκορπαῖος*<sup>36</sup> and this from the plural *σκορπαῖοι*, i.e., *σκορπαῖος*; likewise, *ἐχίνος*→*ἐχινάιος*→*ἄχινιός*; *κόρις*→*κοραῖος*→*κοριός*.<sup>37</sup> Not yet explained is the form *ἡλιος*, which is still used in place of *ἥλις*, which one would expect,<sup>38</sup> but *πλούσιος* is an adjective and does not belong here (see below, p. 259).

Defying any explanation as yet are a number of Modern Greek neuters, such as the following:

*χαρτίον* or *χαρτιό*, "paper" in Cappadocia (Farasa, Sinassos); *χαρτί* in standard Modern Greek (from *χαρτίον*)  
*φορτίον*, *φορτιό*, "load," beside *φορτί* (*φορτίον*) elsewhere (Aetolia, Acarnania)

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. *GGA*, 1899, p. 520.

<sup>32</sup> The Modern Greek form *σκορπίος* in Chios was explained by analogy to *κορίος* "bedbug," by G. Hatzidakis (*Αθήνα*, XXIX [1917], 217); but, then, after what model has *κόρις* (δ) been transformed into *κορίος*? (See below, n. 81.)

<sup>33</sup> In this way also ancient Greek *καβλίος* has been transformed to *καβαῖος* (Modern Greek dialectal form) and from this into *καβέλιος*.

<sup>34</sup> In the case of Modern Greek *ἡλιος* (*hlios*) it is easy to assume maintenance of the ancient form *ἡλιος* instead of the Koine form *ἥλις* (*P Holm.*, 6.43, *ἥλις*, third or fourth century of our era) and Modern Greek (dialectal in Thrace) *ἡλις*, under influence of the church language; the full form *ἡλιος* was very frequently heard in the church liturgy (see W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des neuen Testaments*<sup>1</sup> [Berlin, 1937], p. 576, s.v. *ἡλιος*).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, II, 325; IV, 321; *Πόπλις* not from *Πόπλιος*, as A. M. Woodward (*op. cit.*, p. 90) thought. Cf. below, pp. 254, 259.

<sup>32</sup> See the collection of seventy-five texts from the Seleucid and Attalid kingdoms and from the Asiatic dependencies of the Ptolemaic kings of Egypt and the minor kingdoms of Asia Minor in C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven, 1934).

<sup>33</sup> *Glotta*, IV (1913), 320.

<sup>34</sup> *KZ*, XXXI (1892), 110 f. = *Einführung in die neugriechische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1892), pp. 316 f.

θερίδ, in Crete also *θερί*, "monster" (*θηρίον*)  
*κωλί* and *κωλί* (*κωλίον*), "buttocks"  
*χωρί*, "village," *χωρί* (second or third century of our era) (*χωρίον*)  
*ψωλί*, "penis," no variant in -i  
*τοιχί* and *τοιχί*, "wall," no variant in -i (*τοιχίον*)  
*μοχλί*, "lever," in Cappadocia (Farasa) from anc. *μοχλίον*, "small bar, lever, crowbar" (derived from *μοχλός*, m.)  
*άνιψι* beside *άνιψιο* (*άνέψιον*), "nephew"  
*σάλιο*, "saliva," beside dialectal *σάλι* (*σιάλιον*)  
*άλωνι*, "threshing-floor," standard Modern Greek; *άλωνιο* in Delphi (*άλώνιον*)  
*τσώφλιο* beside *τσώφλι*, "skin, peel" (*έξώφλιον*?)  
*θεμέλιο*, "foundation," standard Modern Greek beside *θεμέλι* (*θεμέλιον*)  
*άνώφλι*, "lintel," *κατώφλι*, "threshold," standard Modern Greek; *άνώφλιο* and *κατώφλιο* dialectal  
*φύλλιο* beside *φύλλι*, "graft" (substantivized *έμφύλλον*, "graft," Eust., 1423. 38),<sup>39</sup> etc.

But these -io forms have arisen probably through the influence of the written language and specifically by analogy to the forms of the written language or fixed through the large system of neuters ending in -o (ancient Greek -ον), such as *τὸ μῆλο*, *τοῦ μῆλου*, *τὰ μῆλα*, etc. One could not, in my opinion, understand them by

supposing that they are exceptions for the reason proposed by Hatzidakis<sup>40</sup>—that the analogy, proceeding slowly, has not affected them; the analogy will hardly be able to affect them any longer, for these words have had this form for many centuries.

On the other hand, forms like *Γεώργιος* (nom. sg.), *Γεώργιε* (voc. sg.), *Δημήτριος*—*Δημήτριε*, *Εὐγένιος*—*Εὐγένιε*, *Εὐτύχιος*—*Εὐτύχιε*, etc., instead of later and Modern Greek *Γιώργις*—*Γιώργι*, *Δημήτρις*—*Δημήτρι*, *Εὐγένις*—*Εὐγένι*, *Εὐτύχις*—*Εὐτύχι*, etc., have been literary from the pre-Christian era until now; on the other hand, the forms -is, -iv, -i (*Δημήτρις*, *Δημήτριν*, *Δημήτρι*, etc.) have been entirely alive (see n. 1, above). The normative grammar of antiquity was bound to the literary forms -ios, -ion, -ie, and did not take into consideration the living usage of its own time; as a parallel, the same is true of the vocatives *Ἀγαθοκλῆ*, *Δημοσθένη*, *Μενεκράτη*, etc., as opposed to the literary (older) vocatives *Ἀγαθόκλεις*, *Δημόσθενες*, *Μενέκρατες*, etc.<sup>41</sup>

As to the interpretation of the phenomenon of the endings -is, -iv, various explanations have been made which I shall now summarize and evaluate.

#### INFLUENCE OF LATIN OR OF ITALIC

Transition of the syncope of the -u- in Latin nouns ending in -ius, e.g., *Clodius* for *Clodius*, *Cornelius* for *Cornelius*, etc., was accepted by F. Ritschl.<sup>42</sup> Then, K. Foy<sup>43</sup> suggested that this syncope "sich bei

<sup>39</sup> *Ἀθηνά*, XII (1900), 113 = *Einleitung*, p. 312.

<sup>40</sup> On this see W. Schulze, *Ἀντίκορον, Festschrift J. Wackernagel . . . gewidmet* (Göttingen, 1924), p. 245 = Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen, 1934), p. 89 (cf. n. 1, above).

<sup>41</sup> *De declinatione quadam Latina reconditiore quaestio epigraphica* (Bonn, 1861), later in F. Ritschl's *Kleine philologische Schriften*, IV (Leipzig, 1878), 446 ff. As to the form *psanterin* for *ψαντήριον* in Dan. 3:5, 7, 10, 15 (165 B.C.), he conceded that Roman influence was out of the question (*Kl. Schr.*, IV, 468). Against Ritschl is Benseler (*op. cit.*, pp. 149 f., 177).

<sup>42</sup> *Lautsystem der griech. Vulgärsprache* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 127.

<sup>39</sup> The common Modern Greek form *ψοφίμ* (for and beside *ψοφίμο*, Cythera) does not belong here, although it is placed here by Dieterich, *op. cit.*, p. 67, and by G. Hatzidakis, *Ἀθηνά*, XII (1900), 286; the older form is *ψοφίμο*, from *ψοφίμ*; and this comes from *ψοφίμα* (cf. *θησιμαίον*, "carcass of an animal," synon. Mod. Gr. *θασίμι*). The form *ψοφίμ* arose from *ψοφίμο* by some analogy, according to the scheme *θαλάμια* (plur.): *θαλάμι* (sg.), *καλάμια* (plur.): *καλάμι* (sg.), and similar pairs; the neuter subst. *έγριμαίον*, "wild game" (second century of our era): pl. *έγριμαία* (of the adj. *έγριμαίος* "wild") became medieval *έγριμαίων*, Mod. Gr. *έγριμο*, "wild animal" and pl. *έγριμαία*—*έγριμια*; and from the latter came a new sg. *έγριμι*, "wild animal," and in Crete "wild goat" (beside *έγριμο*) (see G. Hatzidakis, "Νεοελληνικά," *Ἀθηνά*, XXII [1910], 240 f.).

näherer Berührung der beiden genannten Idiome [of vulgar Latin and vulgar Greek] mehr und mehr verbreitete, bis sie allgemein wurde." Eckinger expresses himself similarly.<sup>44</sup>

Hatzidakis<sup>45</sup> wanted to explain the proper nouns in *-is* (also the substantives in *-áris*) through analogy with Italic, saying:

Die Griechen hörten überall die Römer einander rufen *Juli, Gai, Antoni, Aureli, Petroni, Mari* etc.; und von den Vokativen konnten sie sich gewiss keinen anderen Nominativ denken und bilden als *Ἰούλις, Πετρώνις, Αὐρήλις, Μάρις* etc. ganz nach dem Schema *Ἀλκιβιάδῃ—Ἀλκιβιάδης, Εὐπολί—Εὐπολὺς*. . . Die Römer bildeten auf *-ius*, nicht *-is* den Nom.; dies ist aber für die weitere Entwicklung desselben im Griechischen gleichgültig.<sup>46</sup>

J. Schmitt's<sup>47</sup> hesitation, which K. Sandfeld<sup>48</sup> also shares, in agreeing that a Latin case form was carried over into Greek and replaced the Greek case form in an unintelligible way is not forceful. The important thing is whether the few names—*Αὐρήλις, Ἰούλις, Οὐαλέρις, Πετρώνις*, etc.—of Latin origin could influence the numerous Greek names—*Εὐθύμιος, Προκόπιος*, etc. I consider it very improbable.

Hatzidakis' acceptance was at first shared by A. Thumb,<sup>49</sup> who was, however, not completely satisfied regarding the neuters in *-iv*; "Nur die Neutra auf *-iv* (*-iv*) geben zu denken, weil man ihr frühzeitiges Auftreten neben den Namen auf

*-is* nicht erwartet."<sup>50</sup> But later on, when reviewing Mayser's grammar, he looked upon the influence of Latin as out of the question, just because the forms in *-is*, *-iv* appear as early as 258 B.C.<sup>51</sup> A. Jannaris and G. Meyer,<sup>52</sup> S. Witkowski,<sup>53</sup> E. Mayser,<sup>54</sup> E. Schwyzler,<sup>55</sup> and others also expressed their opinion against Latin influence.

It is also important that the vocative forms in *-ie* of personal names of Latin origin on Greek papyri and inscriptions are attested more copiously than those ending in *-i*. On the one hand, only forms in *-i* are attested, e.g., *Ἀγέντι, Βελένι, Οὐαλέρι, Πομπήι, Σάλβι, Φλάουι*; cf. Greek personal names on Greek (Cyprian) inscriptions: *Ἀφροδίσι* (Di Cesnola, *Cyprus* [1878], p. 434, No. 64) beside *Ἀφροδείσει* (*BCH*, III, 174, No. 48), perhaps *Δημήτρι* (*ibid.*, 175, No. 49), *Διονύσι* (*ibid.*, XX, 344, No. 17), etc. (see above, n. 1). On the other hand, we find *Ἀντώνι* beside *Ἀντώνιε, Ἰούλι* beside *Ἰούλιε*, and *Κλαῦδι* beside *Κλαύδιε*; finally, the *-ie* form alone is attested in *Γάιε, Ἐρέννιε, Κανίνιε, Κλώδιε, Κούρτιε, Λεύκιε, Λούκιε, Μάρκιε, Οὐάλγιε, Οὐείβιε, Πόπλιε, Σερονείλιε, Σήτιε, Στάτιε, Τιβέριε, Φλαμένιε*, and *Φούριε*. In the accusative, *Κωνσάντιν* (fourth century of our era) and *Αὐρήλιν* (second century of our era) are attested beside twenty-two forms in *-ιον*; in the nominative twenty forms in *-is* and forty-three in *-ιος* are attested, while the genitive always ends in *-ιον*.<sup>56</sup> Certainly noteworthy, too, is the fact that the Latin words from which such Greek loanwords as *διπλοκάρις, λειβλάρεις, λογι-*

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>45</sup> *KZ*, XXXI (1892), 112 = *Einleitung*, pp. 317 ff.; *Ἀθηνά*, XI (1899), 288 ff. Partly against Hatzidakis is J. Psichari, *Études de philologie néo-grecque* (Paris, 1892), pp. 226–38 (see below, p. 251).

<sup>46</sup> *Einleitung*, p. 317; such nominatives, however, exist (see Ritschl, *Kl. Schr.*, and below, p. 251).

<sup>47</sup> *IF*, *Anzeiger*, XII (1901), 76.

<sup>48</sup> *Linguistique balkanique* (Paris, 1930), p. 101.

<sup>49</sup> *IF*, *Anzeiger*, II (1892), 182, and *Die griech. Sprache*, pp. 154 ff.; with him also Meinersmann, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Cf. also C. D. Buck, *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects* (Boston, 1928), p. 336, s.v. "κασιγητόριον."

<sup>50</sup> *Die griech. Sprache*, p. 155.

<sup>51</sup> *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, IV (1908), 491.

<sup>52</sup> G. Meyer, *IF*, *Anzeiger*, VIII (1897), 70; Jannaris, *op. cit.*, p. 113, § 301.

<sup>53</sup> *Bursians Jahresbericht*, CXX (1905), 195.

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 260, n. 2.

<sup>55</sup> *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 472.

<sup>56</sup> On the above examples cf. Chr. Döttling, *Die Flexionsformen lat. Nomina in den griech. Papyri und Inschriften* (Lausanne, 1920), pp. 40 ff.

ωνάρης, βενεφικιάρης, λεντιάρης, ράδης, etc. (gen. -ίου, dat. -ίω, acc. -ιον) have been derived always ended in -ārius and never in -āris;<sup>57</sup> likewise, the nouns in -ιν (certainly beside -ιον), such as βενεφίκιν, έξονπλάριν, πωμάριν, τρουλιν, and φιβλατάριν have been taken over from Latin words ending in -ium.<sup>58</sup>

Although Hatzidakis' explanation is refuted through ancient examples (of the time before the imperial age), I ought, however, to mention it because the same scholar, though he abandoned this explanation, continued to believe in Italic influence. The innumerable names in -is that had been brought from Italy, he thought, would have caused the formation of Greek forms in -is instead of -ios to prevail.<sup>59</sup>

Psichari<sup>60</sup> also considered Hatzidakis' Latin starting-point as granted but saw the nom. sg. in -is as the precise starting-point of the analogy, e.g., Αὐρήλις for Aurelis, which would have affected the Greek nouns in -ios; on the other hand, the acc. sg. in -ιν (Αὐρήλιν, like μάντιν, δόφιν, πρύτανιν, etc.) and voc. sg. in -ι beside -ιε (Αὐρήλι for and beside Αὐρήλιε, like μάντι, πρύτανι, etc.) would be rare and therefore not of importance. As to the neuters in -ιν, Psichari says: "L'analogie a dû commencer par les noms féminins en -ιον = -ιν 'Ελευθέριν Καλλιόστιν ... -ιν est à -is ce que -ιον était à -ios: parce qu'on dit l'un, on dit l'autre. Le génitif était toujours commun aux deux genres. D'où le point de repaire analogique." But as we saw, the nom. sg. of Latin proper nouns cannot have

been the basis, and Psichari's interpretation, therefore, cannot be true.

The suggestion of Döttling<sup>61</sup> that the shortened nouns could have been taken over from Latin into Greek through the medium of Oscan and that the syncope of these nouns would have been that of Oscan -is for -ius (better, for -ios) lacks evidence; and evidence for it appears impossible to secure, because the early contact of the Oscans with Greek civilization does not mean that Greek of the Greek mainland could be influenced by the Oscan dialect; although the phenomenon, known as *samprasāraṇa*, is similar, i.e., in the forms in the nom. -is for -ios and acc. -im for -iom of *praenomina* and *gentilicia*, such as *Dekis*, Latin "Decius"; *Lúwkis*, "Lucius"; *Mais*, "Maius"; *Pakis*, "Pacius"; *Vibis*, "Vibius," but also in Osc. *pústiris*, "posterius"; *fortis*, "fortius"; *degetasis*, etc.,<sup>62</sup> such an influence upon Greek seems imaginary.

Since Latin *alis*—*alid* for *alius*—*aliud* is a new phonetic development<sup>63</sup> and since the Greek forms in -is, -ιν, on the other hand, occur from the third century B.C., the thesis of Latin influence in this respect must be regarded as disproved.

#### THE EXPLANATION THROUGH INNER ANALOGY IN GREEK

For the explanation of the later ancient Greek forms in -is, -ιν, one should, according to G. Meyer,<sup>64</sup> start from pet names, because the shortening (*Βασίλεις* for -ειος) is genuine Greek and peculiar to the pet form; after *Βασίλεις* and similar forms the forms in -άρις arose; from

<sup>57</sup> Cf. also Hatzidakis, 'Αθηνά, XII (1900), 286, n. 1.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Döttling, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 ff.

<sup>59</sup> 'Ακαδημικά ἀναγνώσματα, II<sup>1</sup> (1904), 514; Hatzidakis certainly must have influenced A. Thumb, too (*Handbuch d. neugriech. Volkssprache*<sup>3</sup> [Strassburg, 1910], p. 48), who says that the number of words in -is has been considerably increased through the suffix -άρις from Latin -arius.

<sup>60</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 228 ff.

<sup>61</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

<sup>62</sup> See R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, II (Strassburg, 1897), 132 ff.; C. D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*<sup>2</sup> (Boston, 1928), pp. 60, 121–23.

<sup>63</sup> Stolz and Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*<sup>5</sup> (Munich, 1928), p. 94; cf. F. Sommer, *Kritische Erläuterungen zur lat. Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1914), pp. 119 ff.

<sup>64</sup> *IF, Anzeiger*, VIII (1897), 70.

the neuters, in turn, the form τὸ νησί beside gen. νησιού, plur. nom. νησιά, gen. νησιῶν, would have been formed by analogy to βαθύ—βαθιού—βαθιά—βαθιῶν. This explanation, to be sure, rested on Modern Greek conditions only, for the forms of the pre-Christian inscriptions and of the papyri were unknown.

A. Koraës had already (1805) confirmed the shortened ancient Greek forms Βάκχis (beside Βάκχios), Χρόmis (beside Χρομίος), etc., and had suspected that the syncope had passed from those proper nouns to the nouns like κύρις (for κύριος); to the names of the months like Ἰανουάρις, etc.; and to nouns ending in -άρις, like ἀμαξάρις, etc.<sup>65</sup> According to F. G. Benseler,<sup>66</sup> -ιος was contracted to -is, e.g., Βάκχis from Βάκχios, Δήmis from Δήμιος, etc., while Ἀλεξis came from Ἀλεξ— with an ending -ι-. Likewise D. Mavrophrydes<sup>67</sup> placed Ἀλεξis beside Ἀλέξιος and Στράττις beside Στράττιος, etc.; and K. Foy<sup>68</sup> also compares the Doric forms Κλεόβις (Κλεόβιος), Πόντις (Πόντιος), and others.

A. Jannaris advanced a similar thesis, which becomes complicated. He suggests the explanation of the masc. in -is, -iv by the analogy of ancient Gr. Βάκχis to Βάκχios and the like, and at the same time by the influence of the nouns in -ης (ναύτης, Ἀριστείδης, etc.), so that shortened masculine proper names in -is (from -ιος) affected also the appellatives in -ιος (κύριος→κύρις, περδικάριος→περδικάρις, Ἀπρίλις, Μάις, Μάρτις). As to the neuters in -iv the women's names in neuter form, such as Ἀρτέμιν, Ἐρώτιν, etc., were, in Jannaris' opinion, shortened from -ivov

for the sake of convenience; and these proper names in -iv thereafter affected the whole class of the appellative neuters in -ivov; he also assumes, however, that the neuter formation in -iv was first suggested by the presence of "corresponding familiar neuters in -ι," such as ἄμι (ἄμμι), "caraway," κίκι, "castor-oil," κοῦκι (Lat. *cuci*), μέλι, σάρι, "Cyperus auricomus," σίλι, etc.<sup>69</sup> The proceeding of the assumed analogy from some rare proper nouns to the appellatives does not seem to be convincing; the names in nom. -ης, acc. -ην, certainly coincided with the later Greek names terminating in -is, -iv, but could hardly be the starting-point of the analogy because of the difference in the pronunciation of η as εῖ (ναύτης, Ἀλκιβιάδης, etc.) and of ι for the stage when -is, -iv first appear. The neuters in -ι of the third declension, on the other hand, could hardly suggest the neuter form -iv (ἀργύριν, etc.) of the second declension.

Upon these opinions Hatzidakis then builds his own most recent explanation. The forms in -is must be of Greek origin and must have been transformed by analogy with other Greek words. As in ancient Greek, ἄγis (beside Ἀγίας, Ἀγίων), Ἀθηνis (beside Ἀθηνίας, -νίων), Ἀλεξis (beside Ἀλεξίας, -ξων), Βάκχis, Στρώφis, Χρόmis, etc., as well as the appellatives γάστρις (from γαστρίμαργος), γίννις (from γύνανδρος), στρόφis (from πολύστροφος), and others have been formed. Thus, by analogy also, the later ancient Greek forms Διονύσις (for Διονύσιος), Ἐλευθέρις (for Ἐλευθέριος), Εὐθύμις, etc., originated. This ending was gradually transferred to the appellatives (and to the neuters).<sup>70</sup> This interpretation has been proposed by E. Mayser, independently of Hatzidakis. The Greek personal names in

<sup>65</sup> A. Koraës, *Πρόδρομος Ἑλληνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης* (Paris, 1805), p. 353; cf. E. Pezopoulos, "Ὁ Ἀδαμάντιος Κωραῖς ὡς φιλόλογος," in *Ἡ ἑκατονταετηρίδα τοῦ Ἀδαμάντιου Κωραῖ* (Athens, 1935), p. 260.

<sup>66</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 179 ff.

<sup>67</sup> *Δοκίμιον ἱστορίας τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης* (Smyrna, 1871), pp. 432 f.

<sup>68</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

<sup>69</sup> Jannaris, *op. cit.*, pp. 293 (§ 1040), 113 (§ 298), 114 (§§ 302-3).

<sup>70</sup> Hatzidakis, *Ἀθήνα*, XII (1900), 285 ff.; *Ἀκαδημαϊκά ἀναγνώσματα*, II<sup>1</sup>, 514.

-is instead of -ios, Mayser argues, have been formed through the influence of the ancient Greek diminutive personal names, such as Δάμης, Ζεύης, and the like, i.e., by analogy;<sup>71</sup> on the other hand, the syncope of the diminutive neuters in -iv instead of -iov, Mayser submitted, took place phonetically.<sup>72</sup> Rejection of this opinion was the reaction of, for instance, J. Moulton.<sup>73</sup> Thumb, moreover, who kept following up the problem because he was interested in it, considered Hatzidakis' second explanation "objectionable" ("nicht einwandfrei").<sup>74</sup> He considered that any connection of the forms in -is, -iv with the short names, such as Δάμης, Ζεύης, and the like, is improbable, first, because the ancient Greek forms Εὐθύμης, Προκόπης, etc., formed no gen. in -ιδος (or in -ιτος), which their models had, and, second, because the formation in -iv of the neuters had already (258 B.C.) been represented in the written tradition earlier than had the proper nouns.<sup>75</sup> Both reasons are substantial and still valid against this interpretation.<sup>76</sup> Mayser's and Dieterich's two-fold explanation—i.e., one analogic for the masculine proper nouns and appellatives in -is, the other phonetic for the neuters in -iv—, is not plausible.<sup>77</sup> Nor is there any probability in the analogic influence—accepted by Dieterich and explained phonetically by him—of the neuters in -iv on the masculines in -ios; for as Döttling<sup>78</sup> rightly observed, the masculine suffix -is seems to have been as early as the neuter

-iv. Moreover, an analogic influence of the neuters ἀργύριον, κτένιον, παίδιον, στάδιον, χέριον, etc., on the proper nouns Ἀπολλώνιος, Ἀφροδίσις, Δημήτρις, Διονύσις, and the like cannot readily be accepted; what was said above is naturally true as to the influence of the latter nouns on the former ones.

#### THE ATTEMPTED PHONETIC EXPLANATION

In treatments of this problem a phonetic explanation appeared likely from the beginning and seemed with some reason to be expected; for a similar phonetic development in other languages could be cited. The fact, which I have already mentioned, that shortened forms of proper nouns could be attested in Oscan (-is for older -ios) justifies this point of view.

First, K. Dieterich<sup>79</sup> gathered the examples of -iv for -iov and -iv for -ιον and suggested that the vowel cluster -io- became -i-, in which the accented -i- suppressed the following unaccented -o- (in the same way he explained forms with -ε from -εο-). Accordingly, the neuter -iv must have originated in numerous instances, and only then was this syncope transferred to the less numerous instances of the proparoxytone neuters in -ιον.<sup>80</sup> But, as Hatzidakis<sup>81</sup> observed, the proparoxytone neuter nouns in -ιον are, conversely, more numerous than the paroxytone ones; however, this fact is not in favor of Hatzidakis' analogic explanation, for—as K. Krumbacher reminds us in his review<sup>82</sup>—the number of instances has no bearing on the spread of an

<sup>71</sup> *Op. cit.*, I (1906), 260 n., and I<sup>2</sup>, 2. Teil, 16, n. 1; L. Radermacher (*Neutestament. Gramm.*<sup>2</sup> [Tübingen, 1925], p. 60, n. 3) agrees with him.

<sup>72</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 260 n., and I<sup>2</sup>, 2. Teil, 16, n. 1.

<sup>73</sup> *CR*, XVIII (1904), 109.

<sup>74</sup> *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, III (1906), 467.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, IV (1908), 491.

<sup>76</sup> Rejected also by Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 472.

<sup>77</sup> Mayser's view is opposed, e.g., by Hauser, *op. cit.*, p. 81; Döttling, *op. cit.*, p. 57, n. 1. Against Dieterich is W. Schmid, *Wochenschr. f. klass. Philol.*, XVI (1899), 509.

<sup>78</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>79</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 63 ff.

<sup>80</sup> Accepted by Meinersmann, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

<sup>81</sup> *GGA*, 1899, p. 520 = *Δθνη*, XII (1900), 285. Hatzidakis' objection, however, that nouns ending in -ιος preserved their -o- is not weighty, because *ἐνάντιος* is an adjective, *ποῖός* is a pronoun, and the substantives *κοιλίος*, *κοβίος*, *ξίφιος*, and *σκορπίος* can be explained otherwise (see above, p. 248).

<sup>82</sup> *BZ*, X (1901), 325.

analogic phenomenon. In this way Dieterich entirely separates the neuters from the masculines in *-is* (= *-ios*) and considers each of the two classes separately; but this is methodologically improbable.

Phonetic considerations also underlay Meisterhans' (and Schwyzer's)<sup>83</sup> acceptance of contraction, a view which E. Mayser<sup>84</sup> rejected. Kretschmer assumed that in a limited district, where Laconia belonged, *-io-* as a rule became *-i-*, and this, in turn, spread to the later Greek popular language of other districts.<sup>85</sup> The phenomenon is, in Kretschmer's opinion, a contraction *ω > ι* and a Dorism of the Koine (this suiting his theory of the rise of the Koine), all the more so as there appears in later Laconian *-is* (*-ip*) gen. sg. for *-ios* (*-iop*) (from *-eos*). Cf. Καλλικράτης, Ἀριστοτέλης [η = ι] from Ἀριστοτέλιος from Ἀριστοτέλεος, *σι-* = *θεο-* and *σίν* = *θεόν*, in Σίδαμος, Σιδέκτας, Σικλῆς, Σιμήδης, Σίπομπος, σιφόρος, Σιχάρης (beside Doric Θέδωρος, Κλέστρατος, Νεμήνιος, etc., i.e., *ε* from *εο*).<sup>86</sup> Herein Hatzidakis<sup>87</sup> and Schwyzer<sup>88</sup> agree. The latter also thinks that it is a later contraction of *-io-* to *-i-*, but questions that it is Doric. S. Kapsomenos,<sup>89</sup> following Kretschmer, thinks that important progress has been made in the problem.

For all this, however, Hauser's objection has not been disposed of, viz., that the examples from Laconia belong to the first century and those from Egypt as

early as the third century B.C.<sup>90</sup> At any rate, it seems improbable to me that it is a genuine Doric phonetic innovation and that it could ever have spread into the wide districts of Egypt and Asia Minor. Finally, I hope to show, by the explanation given below, that the assumption of a Dorism is not necessary. The Dorism is, furthermore, impossible for the very reason that, in Doric, *εο* became *ω* from the fourth century and *ω* later changed to *ι* in any position in the word, e.g., Θιοκορμίδας (BSA, XXIV, 90), Θιοκλε (Sparta), Αὐτοκλῆος (GDI, 4515; IG, V, Part 1, 145) and, with the change *ω* to *ι*, Νηκλέος (GDI, 4516; IG, Part 1, 26) for Νικλέος from Νιοκλέος (Νεοκλέους), Κλήνικος for Κλίνικος, Σιδέκτας, Σικλῆς, Σιμήδης, Σιχάρης, etc. How could the contracted *ι* for *ω* have spread from Laconian to the Koine but have become there restricted to the endings *-ios* and *-ion* only, these being changed to *-is* and *-iv*, and not have been generally accepted? And there are actually lacking in the Koine instances such as \*Δινύσις for Διονύσις, \*ἡμίλιν for ἡμιόλιν, \*ἡμιβέλιν for ἡμιωβέλιν, or any similar instances such as we have in New Laconian.

From the foregoing it can be inferred that a satisfactory explanation of the nominal forms *-is*, *-iv* has not yet been found and that, in spite of the attempted explanations, all are conscious of this.<sup>91</sup> The phonetic explanation has not been

<sup>83</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>84</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 154.

<sup>85</sup> *Glotta*, IV (1913), 321.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, and X (1920), 227.

<sup>87</sup> Ἀκαδημικά ἀναγνώσματα, I<sup>2</sup> (1924), 242 f. The author contradicts himself, however, in II (1930), 375-76, by saying that those nouns in *-is*, *-iv* have been formed analogically.

<sup>88</sup> *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 472.

<sup>89</sup> Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον, I (Athens, 1939), 60, n. 1. In order to corroborate Kretschmer's acceptance, Kapsomenos brings up examples of contraction, such as ἰδιωτῶν (for ἰδιωτικῶν), ἐισχόμεν (for ἐισχωμέν), δέξις (for δεισιθεῖς), etc., which cannot, in my opinion, be taken into consideration, because they are late, false spellings. Cf. below, n. 93.

<sup>90</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 81.

<sup>91</sup> Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, 260, n. 2, and II, 2, Teil, 16, n. 1; Thumb, *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, IV (1908), 491 ("Ich gestehe, die ganze Bildung wird mir immer dunkler, je mehr darüber geschrieben wird"); and K. Brugmann and A. Thumb, *Griech. Gramm.*<sup>4</sup> (Munich, 1913), p. 213 n.; S. Psaltes, *Gramm. d. byz. Chroniken* (Göttingen, 1913), p. 57 (he agrees with the above opinion of Thumb); A. Boutouras, *Φωνητικά καὶ ὀρθογραφικά τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς* (Athens, 1911), p. 12. Yet most of the scholars are inclined to accept Dieterich's explanation (cf. Mayser, *op. cit.*, I [1906], 260, n. 2; Radermacher, *op. cit.*, p. 60 and n. 3; also Costas, *op. cit.*, p. 169, n. 4).

successful.<sup>92</sup> Among the objections to it is especially that of Hatzidakis, that, for instance, *ἰονθος* did not become *ἴνθος* but in Modern Greek *jóthos*.<sup>93</sup> In my opinion, there is, however, only one unified explanation possible, i.e., the phonetic one, because the form *ἀργύριον* can never be explained analogically or through foreign influence.<sup>94</sup> For this there are clear phonetic conditions: *ἰονθος* is certainly not the same as *ἴον* or *ἰόν* in *ἀργύριον* or *παῖδιον*, respectively; in the latter the word ending *-ιον* is involved, and the phonetic history of initial and medial sounds, as is well known, may be different from that of final sounds (cf. dropping of the final sound, e.g., in the Germanic languages). The phonetic explanation must, however, embrace the neuters as well as the masculines, without claiming an analogic influence of the masculines upon the neuters (as Hatzidakis did) or vice versa (Dieterich). We find this phonetic solution, I believe, on the basis of our material.

#### A UNIFIED EXPLANATION

It is known that fully gathered, systematically classified, and well-examined material easily affords ready explanation. Also the elucidation of inflectional forms is based largely on the phonology.<sup>95</sup> Experience gained in the case of living, modern languages can likewise be transferred to older linguistic conditions;<sup>96</sup> or,

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Thurnb., *Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, p. 154.

<sup>93</sup> GGA, 1899, p. 520 = *Ἀθηνᾶ*, XII (1900), 285; *Μεσαιωνικά καὶ νέα Ἑλληνικά*, II (1907), 356; the same author in *Ἀκαδημικά ἀναγνώσματα*, II<sup>1</sup> (1904), 514. Such Greek spellings as *Κυρακός*, *τιμωτάτης*, *φυλακτῆριον*, *κυριοτήτων* have already been excluded by Hatzidakis (GGA, 1899, pp. 510 f.) and quite rightly (cf. above, n. 89).

<sup>94</sup> For a phonetic interpretation of the phenomenon cf. also P. Chantraine, *BSL*, XXXIX (1938), 52.

<sup>95</sup> Thus Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 13.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. E. Gamillscheg, *Die Sprachgeographie und ihre Ergebnisse für die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1928), p. 71.

rather, only in phenomena of the present, which are immediately accessible to the experience, can we learn how the processes of the past are to be judged.<sup>97</sup>

The phonetic change of the endings (*-ιος* to *-ις*, *-ιον* to *-ιν*) is, viewed externally, a syncopation. But this external observation does not by any means constitute an explanation of the phenomenon. How can the *-ο-* after *-ι-* have been dropped?

First, instances like *Πτολεμαῖς* (second century B.C.), *Θοτορταῖς* (from the third and second centuries B.C.), *Εἰρηναῖς*, *Βαρβολομαῖς*, *Ῥωμαῖς*, etc., must be left out of consideration, for they do not belong here; as even Schwyzler<sup>98</sup> has remarked, *-αῖς* was at that time pronounced *-εs*<sup>99</sup> and came from *-αῖος* (= *-έος*). But the phonetic explanation of *-αῖς* (= *-es*) from *-αῖος* (= *-eos*), such as that of Dieterich,<sup>100</sup> is not obvious; one would rather expect the result *-ος*. In my opinion, the inference is probable that in the vocative singular, *Βαρβολομαῖε*, *Εἰρηναῖε*, *Θοτορταῖε*, *Πτολεμαῖε*, *Ῥωμαῖε*, etc., the *-αῖε* (i.e., *-έε*) was contracted into *-ε*; cf. Modern Greek *θέ* from *θέε*, Homeric *ἦλέ*, Alcmanic *ὀλέ*, *οῦλε*, Attic *μέλε* from *\*μέλεε* of *μέλεος*, etc.; also *-εὺς* from *-αῖεύς*,<sup>101</sup> *Εἰταῖος* instead of *Εἰτε-αῖος* (third and second centuries B.C.).<sup>102</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Cf. P. Kretschmer, "Sprache," in Gercke and Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*<sup>1</sup>, I, Heft 6 (Leipzig, 1923), 3.

<sup>98</sup> *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 472, n. 4.

<sup>99</sup> For Attic, of course, concurrence of *αι* with *ε* or *η* is attested, though not until the second century of our era; but in Boeotia *η* for *αι* begins as early as the fourth century B.C. (cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, pp. 194 f.). The monophthongization of *αι* to *ε* was accomplished in the second century B.C., in Attic in the imperial age. The earliest examples from the papyri belong to the middle of the second century B.C. (Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, 139; cf. also Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 233). But has *Θοτορταῖς*, belonging to the middle of the third century B.C., also *-εs*? (Cf. above, n. 4.)

<sup>100</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 65; Jannaris, *op. cit.*, p. 113 (§ 299).

<sup>101</sup> Meisterhans, *op. cit.*, p. 35, n. 10.

<sup>102</sup> Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 195.

From those vocatives were then formed the respective nominatives, *Βαρθολομαῖς* etc., with the attached proper sign -s of the nominative. That these exotic forms do not occur in the Greek of the motherland<sup>103</sup> is likewise understandable; those forms really bear the appearance of a dialectal characteristic which could not spread and become general; anyhow, the -o- in these has not been driven out phonetically but through the medium of the vocative.

In an inscription from Fjeri in Albania there also occurs 'Ρωμαῖς (*Mārkos Tύλλιος Μάρκου υἱός 'Ρωμαῖς*),<sup>104</sup> which is to be pronounced *romés* and can be explained from the voc. 'Ρωμαῖ for 'Ρωμαῖε. The analogy 'Αλίπι voc.: 'Αλίπις nom., Γυμνάσι: Γυμνάσις, Ἡμέρι: Ἡμέρις, etc., has obviously influenced the formation voc. -έ: nom. -έ-s, *Βαρθολομαῖ: Βαρθολομαῖς*, *Εἰρηναῖ: Εἰρηναῖς*, *Θογορταῖ: Θογορταῖς*, *Πτολεμαῖ: Πτολεμαῖς*, 'Ρωμαῖ: 'Ρωμαῖς. And this explanation is further corroborated by inscriptional instances from Asia Minor, such as nom. sg. *Δημήτριαις* (for *Δημήτριος*), *Κάσιες* (for *Κάσιος*), 'Απολλώνιες (for 'Απολλώνιος) from Nicaea in Bithynia,<sup>105</sup> and *Λιμνές* (for *Λιμναῖος*) from Phrygia,<sup>106</sup> which do not exhibit weakening of -os to -es, as Koerte assumed,<sup>107</sup> but are rather the voc. form in -ε plus the nom. sign -s; so *Δημήτριε: Δημήτριες*, *Κάσιε: Κάσιες*, 'Απολλώνιε: 'Απολλώνιες, *Λιμνέ* (orthographically *Λιμναῖ* from *Λιμναῖε*): *Λιμνές*—exactly what happens in Modern Greek with nouns of

the first declension: voc. sg. *δέσποτα: nom. sg. δέσποτας, καθηγητά: καθηγητάς*, etc.

Another phase of our material must also be discussed, i.e., the neuter forms in -εῖον of ancient, later, and Modern Greek words for places and tools, such as *ἀγγεῖον, δοχεῖον, σχολεῖον*, etc., that have kept the -o- up to now. Hatzidakis had already observed it;<sup>108</sup> but his explanation that these nouns, which are accented on the long penult (therefore -ῖ-, written -ει-), stood far from the Latin prototypes (such as *Antonius, Iulius*, etc.), accented on the antepenult, is not satisfactory<sup>109</sup> because the hypothesis of Latin influence, in which Hatzidakis himself no longer believed, is untenable. Dieterich, on the contrary, seeks the difference of the nouns in -εῖον in the essence of the ancient accentual conditions (-εῖον had the circumflex), but without success.<sup>110</sup>

As is known, *ει* and *ῖ* had become identical early in the Hellenistic epoch (second century B.C. on Attic inscriptions, third century on Egyptian papyri), and so *ει* was often written *ι*. But the nouns in -εῖον had, in fact, not an *ῖ* (i.e., -ῖον, written -εῖον), but an *ῆ*, i.e., -ῆον (written -εῖον); because *ει* before *α* and *ο* (*εἰα, εἰο*) remained longer in the stage *ῆ* than in the other positions; hence the frequent Hellenistic spelling *ἡα ἡο, εα εο* and Latin *balnēum* from *βαλανεῖον, platēa* from *πλατεῖα*, etc.<sup>111</sup> Accordingly, *ἀγγεῖον* was still pronounced *αγγῆον* in Hellenistic times and did not exhibit the ending -ιον, which is the phenomenon under discussion at present. Forms such as *Σαραπηῶν*

<sup>103</sup> Some other examples are given by Jannaris, *op. cit.*, p. 113 (§ 299) ('Αθήναις, Φιλαθήναις, Ἀρίσταις, Ἑστίαις, Ἥραις, Ἀθήναις, Μούσαις for Ἀθήναιος, Ἀρίσταίος, etc.). Such forms are not to be met in the Byzantine chronicles (S. Psaltes, *op. cit.*, p. 48).

<sup>104</sup> Praschniker and Schober, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

<sup>105</sup> A. Koerte, "Kleinasiatische Studien, V," *Athen. Mitt.*, XXIV (1899), 419.

<sup>106</sup> Koerte, "Kleinasiatische Studien, VI," *ibid.*, XXV (1900), 440, n. 66. Cf. n. 103, above.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, XXIV, 419, n. 1; XXV, 440.

<sup>108</sup> KZ, XXXI (1892), 113 = *Einleitung*, p. 308.

<sup>109</sup> Dieterich (*op. cit.*, pp. 66 f.). In opposition to this attempted explanation of Hatzidakis, adduced the fact that "die Länge und Kürze dem Lateinischen gegenüber ja keine Rolle spielte."

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>111</sup> Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 193 f. and 15; cf. Hatzidakis, *Ἀκαδημικά ἀναγνώσματα*, I<sup>3</sup> (1924), 109.

(=Σαραπιείον), ἐκμαγῆν beside ἐκμαγῆον and ἐκμαγεῖον on Egyptian papyri (from the years 163–160 B.C.) can already mean *-ion*,<sup>112</sup> in which case they could then have coincided with our *-ιον*. The modern Greek dialectal word ἀγγεῖν (in Kerasous of Pontus, beside ἀγγεῖον and ἀγγεῖζον) and ἀγγεῖ on Chios and in southern Italy might, however, be due to the influence of *-iv*, since there occur confusions of *ει* and *ι* on papyri: χαλκεῖον—χαλκίον (second century), μαγειρεῖον—μαγυρίον (third century B.C.), and so forth.<sup>113</sup> Such neuter forms as ἔλαιν, in an Egyptian magic book, for ἔλαιον, and πλῦν (*CIG*, 4712b), neither transmitted to us, in spite of Buresch' statement to the contrary: "Auch heute kann man τὸ *plīn* und unzähliges derlei hören,"<sup>114</sup> ἐκμαγῆν, Modern Greek dialectal ἀγγεῖν (pronounced *ahgēn*) are, in fact, analogically understandable; i.e., on the scheme παιδία: παιδῖν, ὀρνίθια: ὀρνίθιν, etc., where nom. pl. terminates in *-a*: nom. sg. in *-ν*, there has been built up also πλοῖα: πλοῖν (i.e., *plū-a*: *plū-n*), ἔλαια: ἔλαιν (i.e., *ēle-a*: *ēle-n*), ἀγγεῖα: ἀγγεῖν (i.e., *ahgē-a*: *ahgē-n*), etc.

The phonetic explanation of the endings *-is*, *-iv* masc. and *-iv* neut. is as follows:

Even though we cannot now say exactly at what time the unified accentuation (with a prominent factor of stress) prevailed, we know, however, that at the end of the fourth century B.C. a confusion of acute and circumflex was still unendurable. To this old fashion the scholarly linguistic tradition may have adhered

until later times.<sup>115</sup> In the popular speech, however, the expiratory accentuation seems to have existed early (certainly, with local differences), when, e.g., the forms *-is*, *-iv* appeared.<sup>116</sup> Thereafter, a weakening of vowels which were unstressed and stood in a weak position (*e*, *o*) could take place in consequence of the expiratory accent, if another cause were also present.

In this way, I think, the ending *-ion* (i.e., *-ion* or *-ton*, respectively) changed to *-ien*, in which the *e* represents a middle vowel, resultant of the weakened *o* before the nasal *-n*; this *-ien* could then become assimilated to *-iin* and contracted further to *-in*. The contraction of equal vowels gives as a result either a long vowel—here *-ī-*, where the length still exists—or a short vowel—here *-i-*, where the isochronic quality rules. The former case has been attested through the writing παιδεῖν on a Pergamene inscription of the imperial age; συνψέλειν on a Ptolemaic ostrakon; Ἀγρεις, Μητρόβεις, Φλάβεις, etc., on coins from Asia Minor,<sup>117</sup> etc., in which *ει* could indicate the *ī*,<sup>118</sup> in those instances, therefore, a contraction *-iin* to *-in* must certainly have taken place. The *-in* could not be contracted directly from *-ion*, because a back vowel cannot pass directly to the front vowel *i*. That is why I consider the intermediate stage *-ien*, postulated above, as sure. The rest of the

<sup>115</sup> See Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 393 f.

<sup>116</sup> The principle of the stress had replaced that of the musical tones in the later imperial times, about A.D. 500 (see A. Thumb, *Die neugriechische Sprache* [Freiburg i.B., 1892], p. 9; Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 129). The accentuation of the popular language had a distinctly expiratory character as early as the fourth century B.C., according to H. Ehrlich (*Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung* [Berlin, 1912], p. 149); this he infers from the pronunciation of τράων, κρώ, etc.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. above, p. 246.

<sup>118</sup> But it is certain that interchange between *ω* and *ο*, *ει* (= *i*) and *ι* had started in the third century B.C., first in Egypt and Asia Minor (cf. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, p. 149); it perhaps had, however, no general linguistic character.

<sup>112</sup> Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 186 (since the middle of the second century B.C. *η* was exchanged with *ει* and *ι*, also with *ε*); cf. *ibid.*, p. 392 (the confusion of *ε* and *η* began in the third century B.C.).

<sup>113</sup> Mayser, *op. cit.*, I, Teil 3 (1935), 14 f.; Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 193. On χαλκείον and χαλκεῖον cf. Palmer, *op. cit.*, I, Part I, 56.

<sup>114</sup> "Έγγονα und anderes Vulgärgriechisch," *Rhein. Mus.*, XLVI (1891), 204, n. 1.

attested forms in *-ν* show an *ι*, which could arise from *ῑ* or directly from *ῒ*. The length could not have been significant either; so it was not especially marked. Anyway, the instances with *-ν* from the Greek of the motherland of the Hellenistic times (beside the older *-ιον*) do not show length. Thus the development is understood as follows: *ἀργύριον*—\**ἀργύριον*—\**ἀργύριον*—\**ἀργύριον*—\**ἀργύριον*. The vowels *ῑδ*, which originally belonged to two syllables (*ἀργύριον*), next formed a diphthong *ιδ* and thereafter *ῑξ* and finally passed over to the one syllable *-ι*.<sup>119</sup>

Which the first examples were, whether the paroxytone (*παίδιν*) or the proparoxytone (*ἀργύριον*), cannot be decided; it does not seem to me by any means accidental that the most ancient instance (*ἡμιόλιον*, 258 B.C.) and most of the other instances are accented on the antepenult (i.e., *ἡμιόλιον*) and, as already said above (p. 253), are more numerous than the others today as well. Thereto I wish to add also the masculines in *-ις* (instead of *-ιος*), which, as far as I can see, are proparoxytone only; thus it is proved that the *-ο* of *-ιον* stood in a third place (beginning with the accented syllable) and for that very reason was the weakest and so was affected.

How are the masculines in *-ις*, such as *κύρις*, *σύμβις*, etc., and the personal names *Φιλοκύρις*, *Ἀγρεῖς*, *Ἀπολλώνις*, *Ἀφροδίσις*, *Βοήθις*, *Δημήτρις*, *Διονύσις*, *Εὐγένις*, and the like, to be explained? Here it seemed thus far to be only an analogous transition of the result *-ιν* of the neuters (*ἀργύριον*, *ποτήριον*, etc.). The change must, however, have been phonetically valid for the masculine words also under similar conditions. The same conditions occur, in fact, if we give the following formula:

<sup>119</sup> On the vowel contraction of connected syllables see M. Grammont, *Traité de phonétique* (Paris, 1933), p. 223.

*ἀργύριον*—*ιν* acc. neut.: *ἀργύριον* nom. neut. *κύριον*—*ιν* acc. masc.: *ἄ* nom. masc. (= *κύρις*).<sup>120</sup> The common point of the neuters and of the masculines is the acc. sg. form *-ιν*, used equally for both series. The nom. sg. of the masculines became, therefore, *-ις* for *-ιος* by false analogy to the acc. sg. *-ιν*,<sup>121</sup> with which the neuters were phonetically identical.

The same procedure could naturally be thought of for the ending *-ιος*: \**-ιος* > \**-iis* > *-ις*. There are, however, three considerations to be mentioned against it: (1) the first known instances refer to the neuters *-ιν* (*ἡμιόλιον*, etc.), and they are more numerous, while the masculines occur later and more rarely; (2) the neuters *-ιν* have the same form in the acc. and nom. sg., so that the change can more probably be considered to have appeared first in them; (3) the ending *-ιδν* possesses the advantage that the weakening of the *-ο* has come about not only through the expiratory accent but also through the nasalization of the *-ο* as a condition of the weakening (i.e., *-ιον* > *-ιδν* [*δ* = nasalized *ο*] > *-ιδν*). In other respects the masculine and neuter have everything else (except the vocative) in common in the singular: gen. *-ιου*, dat. *-ιφ*. The differentiation of gen. *-ιου* for neuters (*ποτηρίου*, *στρουθίου*, etc.) and *-ι* for masculines (*τοῦ κύρι*, *Εὐσέβ*, *Προκόπ*, etc.) first originated when, later, from nom. (*κύρις*), acc.

<sup>120</sup> The change took place unintentionally: this fact refers to two simultaneous links; it is not *-ις* that expresses the nom. sg., but the opposition *-ιν*: *-ις*, i.e., *-ις* (instead of *-ιος*) expresses the nom. in opposition to the acc. sg. *-ιν*. For this interpretation cf. an analogous case in F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris, 1922), p. 123, or the German translation by H. Lommel (Berlin, 1931), p. 101.

<sup>121</sup> Each transformation has its reaction on the existing system. A single constituent part of the first system, which has been changed, suffices to produce another system (thus De Saussure, *op. cit.*, pp. 121, 124; German trans., pp. 101, 103). The former system runs as follows: *-ιον* acc. sg.: *-ιος* nom. sg.; as the one constituent part of the system was altered, i.e., *-ιν* from *-ιον*, a new system was built up: *-ιν* acc. sg.: *-ις* nom. sg.

(κύριν), and voc. (κύρι), a gen. τοῦ κύρι, Εὐσέβι, Προκόπι, was built up by analogy, i.e., like ὁ στρατιώτης—τοῦ στρατιώτη—τὸν στρατιώτην, Ἀλκιβιάδης—Ἀλκιβιάδῃ—Ἀλκιβιάδην, etc. (see n. 1, above). But the vocatives Ἀπολλώνι and Ἀφροδίσι are old enough; both occur in inscriptions on Arcadian gravestones (IG, V, Part 2, 178 and 207), as W. Schulze pointed out (cf. n. 1, above).<sup>122</sup> Thus the analogy starting in the acc. sg. -ιν affected the other cases of the singular, first the nom., then the voc., and finally the gen.

In the phonetic change -ιον > -ιῶν > -ιν we have, according to the above statements, a combinative change,<sup>123</sup> not an isolative, spontaneous one. It took place at some time when -ι- in -ιον was still syllabic (vocalic) and not at the time when -ι- had become nonsyllabic (consonantal), i.e., ιο=ιο (this change certainly occurred before the tenth century of our era).

The late Laconian examples, Αὐρήλιν, Ἰούλιρ, Πόπλιρ (written Πόπληρ), Τιμάριν (written Τιμάρειν), Φιλάριν, κασσηρατόριν, and similar instances (see above, pp. 247 f., 254), can be best explained as coming from the universal Koine<sup>124</sup> and not vice versa; names such as Αὐρήλιν, Ἰούλιρ, Πόπλιρ, etc. can have penetrated Laconian from the Koine forms Αὐρήλις, Ἰούλις, Πόπλις, etc. On the contrary, the phenomenon of the change -εο- > -ιω- > -ι- is genuine Laconian in σίν, Σιδάμον, Ἀριστοτέλιρ (from -τέλιωρ < -τέλεος), etc.

<sup>122</sup> In Ἀντίφωνοι, *Festschrift J. Wackernagel* . . . *gevidmet*, p. 242 = Schulze, *Kl. Schr.*, p. 84.

<sup>123</sup> On the combinative change in the Romance languages cf. W. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Heidelberg, 1920), pp. 150-78.

<sup>124</sup> "Der junglakonische Dialekt enthielt jedenfalls auch in seiner echten gesprochenen Form hellenistische bzw. vulgärgriechische Elemente . . . κασσηρατόριν . . . zeigt . . . nicht nur Merkmale des alt- und junglakonischen Dialekts, sondern auch die vulgär- und neugriechische Endung -ιν = -ιω" (A. Thumb, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, p. 90; 2d ed. [1932], p. 92.)

There is weight in Hatzidakis' observation<sup>125</sup> that the -ο- remains in adjectives in -ιος (fem. -ία) -ιον, but disappeared, on the other hand, in substantivized adjectives.<sup>126</sup> We have, e.g., the adjectives: ἄγριος—ἄγριον, ἄξιος—ἄξιον, γνήσιος—γνήσιον, διπλάσιος—διπλάσιον, ἐντόπιος—ἐντόπιον, ἴδιος—ἴδιον, νότιος—νότιον, ὄρθιος—ὄρθιον, πλάγιος—πλάγιον, πλούσιος—πλούσιον, σπάνιος—σπάνιον, τίμιος—τίμιον, and so forth. This series of adjectives must be discussed in this connection, since Hatzidakis bases his analogic explanation on those instances and, because of them, rejects the phonetic one.<sup>127</sup>

Are the above instances, we wonder, exceptions which remain unexplained?

If we survey the ancient Greek adjectives, we can state that (beside -ιος, -διος, -σιος, -τήριος) those in -ειος and -αιος also exist; the two latter formations, which likewise contain -ιος, are, however, uncommonly numerous and have partially supplanted the adjectives which end merely in -ιος, e.g., διμηνιαῖος (beside διμήνιος), διπυργιαῖος (beside διπύργιος), ἐνιαυσιαῖος (beside ἐνιαύσιος), θαλασσαιῖος (beside θαλάσσιος), κρυφαῖος (beside κρύφιος), etc. In later times -ειος and -ηιος [= -ῆος] became identical and finally coincided with -ιος.<sup>128</sup> The adjectives in -ειος, however, were pronounced [-ῆος]; those ending in -αιος were pronounced

<sup>125</sup> KZ, XXXI, 110 = *Einleitung*, p. 315; Ἀκαδημαϊκὰ ἀναγνώσματα, II (1930), 376.

<sup>126</sup> Thus, e.g., Modern Greek ἅγις (beside ἅγιος), "saint," κύρις, "father" or "grandfather," τὸ πλά(γ)ι, "slope" (beside adj. πλάγιος), proper nouns, Ὀλύμπιος (from Ὀλύμπιος), etc.

<sup>127</sup> Μεσαιωνικά καὶ νέα Ἑλληνικά, I (1905), 245 ff.; Ἀθηνᾶ, XLV (1933), 195.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 466 ff., 468. On the interchange of -ειος and -ιος see P. Chantraine, *Formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris, 1933), pp. 52 f.; Palmer, *op. cit.*, I, Part I, 20. Furthermore, the suffix -ικός (and, since the fifth century, -ιακός) occurs beside -ειος and -ιος (often with a difference in meaning) (see Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 497; Palmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 f.).

[*-eos*] in later Hellenistic times (while the oxytone ones ending in *-αῖος*, like *κραταῖος*, *παλαιός*, etc., could not lose the *-ό-* in any case). If one also includes the numerous adjectives in *-ικος*, *-ιμος*, *-ινος*, etc., one sees clearly enough that the analogy of the latter with the adjectives in *-ιος* necessarily hindered the change to *-is*, *-iv*. Also the whole system of the adjectives was more rigid than was the case with the nouns. The adjectives in *-ίος* *-ία* *-ιον*, such as *ἄγριος*—*ἀγρία*—*ἄγριον*, *πλάγιος*—*πλάγια*—*πλάγιον*, etc., had to be maintained because there was a long series of adjectives in *-ος*, *-α*, *-ον* (*ἀραιός*—*ἀραιά*—*ἀραιόν*, *βέβαιος*—*βεβαία*—*βέβαιον*, *δικαίος*—*δικαία*—*δικαίον*, *παλαιός*—*παλαιά*—*παλαιόν*, *αὔλειος*—*αὔλεια*—*αὔλειον*, *γελοῖος*—*γελοία*—*γελοῖον*, *νέος*—*νέα*—*νέον*, *ἄδικος*—*ἄδικον*, etc.) which could not undergo the syncopation of the *-ο-*. In addition, it should be remembered that linguistic circumstances which concern nouns are different from those which concern adjectives. First, the substantive is used, on the whole, much more frequently than is the adjective, so that an analogic influence of the former upon the latter fails to take place. Second, the position of the adjective in the sentence is subordinated to that of the noun, because the former is the word determining the latter. Finally, one could consider such an influence only in such cases as nom. acc. sg. neut. *γνήσιον* *ἀργύριον* > *γνήσιν* *ἀργύριν*, *ἄξιον* *παιδῖν* > *ἄξιν* *παιδῖν*; acc. sg. masc. *ἄξιον* *σύμβιν* > \**ἄξιν* *σύμβιν*, *πλούσιον* *κύριν* > \**πλούσιν* *κύριν*; etc. There is really but one single instance of a shortened adjective *ἄξιν* neut. on a papyrus (28 B.C.).<sup>129</sup> and two

dialectal neuter instances in Pontic, where *ἀγνέσιν* *ἀδελφῖν*, "full brother," for *γνήσιν* *ἀδελφῖν* (*γνήσιον* *ἀδελφῖον*; cf. *P. Lips.* 28. 18: *νῖδον γνήσιον καὶ φυσικόν*) and *τὸ λάσιν τὸ κλαδῖν* (*λάσιον* *κλαδῖον*), "bushy, overgrown tree."<sup>130</sup> But such phrases as *λαμπρόν* *ἀργύριν*, *χρυσούν* (later *χρυσόν*) *ποτήριν*, *καλόν* *παιδῖν*, *δίκαιος* *κύρις*, etc., with an adjective with *-ο-* remaining, were far more numerous. Therefore, the adjectives ending in *-ιος*, *-ία*, *-ιον* have remained unaffected by the Hellenistic phonetic change of *-ιον* to *-ιν*.

#### UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

adjectival in form and was substantivized by omitting the word *ἡμέραν*, but *ἐφάριν* by itself is an adverb. Likewise *ἡμιόλιον*, being certainly the neuter of the adjective *ἡμιόλιος* *ἡμιόλια* *ἡμιόλιον*, has been a substantive since Xenophon *Anab.* I. 3. 21, *ἡμιόλιον* (cf. n. 2. above). Mayer's thesis, therefore, that the shortening occurs in adjectives also is not entirely true.

Similarly, medieval Greek *τὸ δεξιόν* (Modern Greek *δεξί*), "the right hand," is to be understood for *τὸ δεξιόν*, for the accented *-ό-* could not have been dropped in the adjective; so, I think, the expression *τὸ δεξιόν* *χίρην* became, analogically, *τὸ δεξιν* *χίρην* and was then substantivized *τὸ δεξιν* (classical Greek *δεξιόν*, too, was substantivized, though in another way [sc. *κίρην*]); the same happened with the fem. *ἡ δεξιά*, "the right hand," from Homer (Homer has *δεξιτερή*, too) down to the New Testament; *ἡ δεξιά* "promise, contract" on papyri of the second to the sixth century. As for the masc., *δεξίς* exhibits *-is* for *-ίος* not, in my opinion, phonetically (so Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.*, I, 586) but by analogy: *δεξίς* from *δεξιός*, formed perhaps by an analogy with *βραχίς* (cf. *μακρὸς* instead of *μακρός*), etc., or of the neuter noun *δεξί(ν)*.

The noun *ἐγκοιμήτριον*, "pall, counterpane," in papyri (163 B.C.; U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, I [Berlin, 1927], p. 393, No. 85, l. 8: *ὀθῖον ἐγκοιμήτριον*) must, according to Mayer (op. cit., I, Tell 2, 55) have been an adjective, with the substantive *ὀθῖον* to be understood; if so, it would be from the adjective *ἐγκοιμήτριος*—*ἐγκοιμήτρια*—*ἐγκοιμήτριον*, and this from the substantive *ἐγκοιμήτρον*. In my opinion, it is rather a diminutive of the noun *ἐγκοιμήτρον* "counterpane," the latter (from *ἐγκοιμῶμαι*, "sleep in") occurring earlier in the third century B.C. and having the same meaning as *ἐγκοιμήτριον*; in the quoted phrase *ὀθῖον ἐγκοιμήτριον*, then, the second word is in apposition.

<sup>129</sup> See A. A. Papadopoulos, "Γλωσσικὰ παρατηρήσεις," *Ἀθηνά*, XXXVII (1925), 171. Analogical formations are found in medieval Greek: *Prodromos*, III, 151 (ed. Hesselung and Pernot); *μέλις* *ἀκάπριν*; III, 292: *κακάβιν* *διώριν*; *Lybiastros* and *Rhodamne* 177: *πρόσωπον* *ἀπαλοσάρκιν*, etc. (cf. Papadopoulos, op. cit.).

<sup>130</sup> See Mayer, op. cit., I, Tell 2 (1938), 16, l. 18; but *ἐφάριν* (= *ἐπαῖριον*) cannot be an adjective (so Mayer, *ibid.*, l. 19), it is an adverb. The phrase (*ἐπὶ*) *τῇ ἐφάριν*, "for tomorrow," is, of course,

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### WHO BUILT THE WALL OF ROME?

Several ancient authors mention the Emperor Aurelian as the builder of the imperial wall of Rome, and there is evidence from both literature and inscriptions that Honorius made contributions to the wall. It was first established in Richmond's great work (*The City Wall of Imperial Rome* [1930]) that the man chiefly responsible for the magnificence of the fortification was neither Aurelian nor Honorius, but someone who lived in the time between them. This builder of the "Second Period" was identified by Richmond, cautiously at first but eventually with confidence, as Maxentius; and, as far as I have observed, the identification has not been questioned.

There is only one sentence in the ancient writings that has any direct bearing on this hypothesis. According to the Chronographer of A.D. 354, Maxentius "fossatum aperuit, sed non perfecit." Richmond does not attach great importance to this passage; but one may note that any weight that it does possess should be counted against Maxentius, not for him, as the builder of the Second Period. From any possible point of view, the unfinished ditch was insignificant in comparison with the magnificent wall, which, if due to Maxentius, would be virtually part of the same project; and the Chronographer, in enumerating the notable works of Maxentius (*templum Romae, thermae in palatio, circus in catacumbas*) would have no reason to mention the lesser contribution to the fortification and omit the greater.

It is not only in this passage that information might be expected. The ancient writings that deal with Maxentius are fairly copious. To be sure, they deal with him largely as the enemy of Constantine, and Richmond (p. 256) believes that Constantinian historians "could hardly be expected to mention a reconstruction which threatened to nullify all Constantine's efforts to capture Rome"; but to mention it would magnify Constantine's achievement. It seems unlikely that the Christian historians

would think the fortification of Rome so creditable to Maxentius that it must be concealed or so unimportant to the campaign that it should be ignored. Zosimos, who was no Christian, overlooked a particularly good opportunity to mention the matter (ii. 16. 2): Maxentius led his army forth in front of Rome, across the bridge that he himself had built, and owls in endless flocks thronged the wall. Surely it would have been natural to add that he himself had built the wall on which the ill-omened birds assembled. Of course, the argument from silence is not so strong as it would be if the historians were first rate; but, in view of what is said and what is not said, it must be reckoned that the ancient writers do not support the attribution to Maxentius.

There are certain historical circumstances that deserve attention in the consideration of probabilities. Richmond notes (p. 252) that three times, while the city was under the control of Maxentius, it was threatened by his foes. The first two threats came in 307, surely before he could have built the Second Period wall, yet he then remained within the shelter of the existing fortification and found it adequate. The armies of Severus and Galerius refrained from testing the wall of the First Period; a wall of which the "scope is clearly to shut chance bodies of undesirables out of the City" (p. 67); a wall "not very large, but sufficiently big to keep out barbarians unprovided with siege-machinery" (p. 242). On the third occasion Maxentius marched forth and was defeated by Constantine. His strategy seems bad, as Richmond and others have observed; but it is particularly remarkable if we must believe that he had just made the fortification immensely more formidable than it had been in 307.

Another hint may be gained from the very reasonable remark of Groag,<sup>1</sup> that Maxentius did an astonishing amount of building, in view

<sup>1</sup> *RE*, XIV, 2459.

of the brevity of his reign and the character of the times. If the Second Period wall is to be added to the constructions known to Groag, astonishment must approach incredulity.

The ancient writers who give the most information about the wall are Zosimos and John Malalas. The former (i. 49) writes: "At that time a wall was built around Rome, which previously had been unwalled; begun by Aurelian, the wall was finished in the reign of Probus."<sup>2</sup> Malalas (xii, p. 299 [Dindorf]) writes: "Hardly had he [Aurelian] begun to reign than he embellished the Walls of Rome, which were dilapidated with age. He himself presided over the work, and compelled the guilds of Rome to work at the task, and when he had finished the Walls, in very short time, he made a sacred decree, that henceforward all the City guilds should be styled Aurelianic."<sup>3</sup>

There is a verbal contradiction between the two writers, in that Zosimos says that the wall was finished by Probus, Malalas that it was finished by Aurelian; and the context makes it clear that this meaning in Malalas does not result from mere looseness of expression. The contradiction could not be resolved before Richmond's study of the wall, but now there is an obvious solution: Aurelian finished the wall of the First Period, Probus built the Second Period wall. At all events we have the relatively good authority of Zosimos for some contribution to the wall by Probus; this is accepted by Richmond and all others; and there is no such testimony for any other emperor between Aurelian and Honorius. It is remarkable that Richmond does not consider, even in one sentence, the possibility that this contribution might be the wall of the Second Period. He takes it to be obvious that the First Period

covers Probus' work as well as Aurelian's, despite Malalas, although he writes (p. 29) that "on the whole, then, the story of Malalas may be accepted as true."

Aurelian began the wall in 271 and Probus became emperor in the summer of 276; therefore, according to Richmond's view, the First Period would extend over five years or more, which hardly corresponds to the "very short time" of Malalas. Richmond makes a number of acute observations on the construction of the wall. It "had to be built at high speed" and "was built to a standard size and pattern" (p. 242); "the use of stock sizes of material may be noted everywhere" (p. 243); "the economy in preparation of material gained by this standardization must have been very great" (p. 244); "the whole design was notable for its simplicity and uniformity" (p. 243); "the design of the works throughout was kept simple and uniform" (p. 248); the wall was built "with maximum speed and economy" (p. 61). Malalas' statement about the guilds or *collegia*, though too brief to convey much definite information, suggests a well-organized and efficient use of labor and gives additional support to the conclusion that the work "was no doubt executed in the minimum amount of time" (p. 248).

As to what the minimum amount of time would be, some hint may be found in the wall at Verona, which was built under Gallienus in eight months, according to an inscription.<sup>4</sup> The remains of this wall are scant in comparison with those at Rome; but, as examined by Richmond in a separate article,<sup>5</sup> they show that the wall was considerably higher than the First Period wall at Rome and just about half as thick; and the length was about five miles, as compared with twelve at Rome. Calculating directly from these figures, one would conclude that the First Period wall might be built in about three years. It is to be noted that two gates, already existing, were incorporated into the wall at Verona. But, on the other hand: a tenth of the Roman wall consisted of incorpo-

<sup>2</sup> ἐπευχίσθη δὲ τότε ἡ Ῥώμη πρότερον ἀνεύχιστος οὖσα· καὶ λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξ Αὐρηλιανοῦ συνεκκληρώθη βασιλευσάντος Προβίου τὸ τεῖχος. (Mendelssohn's text; the manuscript, quoted by Richmond [*op. cit.*, p. 28], has λαβὼν instead of λαβόν).

<sup>3</sup> ἡ μόνον δὲ βασιλευσεν, ἤρξατο τὰ τεῖχη Ῥώμης κτίζειν γενναῖα· ἦν γὰρ τῷ χρόνῳ φθαρμένα. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπίστηκε τῷ ἔργῳ καὶ ἠνάγκαζε τὰ συντεργεῖα Ῥώμης ὑπουργεῖν τῷ κτίσματι καὶ πληρώσας τὰ τεῖχη ἐν ὀλίγῳ πάντῳ χρόνῳ ἐποίησε θείαν αὐτοῦ κλέυσιν, ἵνα ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου οἱ τῆς πόλεως πάσης ἑργαστηριακοὶ Αὐρηλιανοὶ χρηματίζουσι. Schenk's text is quoted, and Richmond's translation (*op. cit.*, pp. 28 f.) except for one phrase which he renders less literally ("when the Walls were finished").

<sup>4</sup> *CIL*, V, 3329 (cf. Richmond, *op. cit.*, p. 30).

<sup>5</sup> *BSR*, XIII (1935), 74-76. On the Porta Borsari and Porta del Leoni, see Kähler in *JdI*, 1935, pp. 138 ff.; and, on the walls, Marconi, *Verona Romana* (1937), pp. 11-23.

rated structures, permitting a considerable saving in material and time; the structure of the wall at Verona does not appear to have been nearly so well suited to rapid and efficient work;<sup>6</sup> and the working force was certainly much larger at Rome. In view of these considerations, the Verona datum might reasonably be regarded as suggesting a duration of two years, rather than three, for the First Period at Rome. Surely it does not support the view that "the time required to complete the work [of the First Period] may easily have been longer than" five years (Richmond, *op. cit.*, p. 30).

Apart from the length of time, it must be considered that between Aurelian and Probus there intervened the reign of Tacitus (about six months) and, in the city at least, the reign of Florianus (about two months). In addition, there was probably an interregnum of five or six months before Tacitus took the throne.<sup>7</sup> It is not easy to believe that Aurelian's labor organization patiently prolonged its plodding progress through all these vicissitudes into the reign of Probus; it is overwhelmingly probable that, if Probus had anything to do with the wall, his work belonged to a second period. That it belonged to the Second Period of Richmond's study does not necessarily follow but is indicated by various considerations: according to its probable duration and the statement of Malalas, the First Period wall was completed by Aurelian; it is improbable that the work, if resumed under Probus, should be indistinguishable in the general uniformity of the First Period; in so far as we know anything about Probus, we know that he was a zealous builder,<sup>8</sup> who would hardly content himself with completing an earlier project, and he is not known to have built anything else at Rome. Finally, the effectiveness of the wall in 307 is

not puzzling, if it had already reached the magnitude of the Second Period.

The indications thus far considered appear definitely to favor the attribution of the Second Period wall to Probus, but it must be confessed that they do not constitute actual proof and might be outweighed by the evidence of the wall itself. Richmond (pp. 87 f., 252) finds the brickwork similar to that of the basilica of Maxentius, and this is not to be ignored; but he deems it "necessary to date the brick-facing of the City Wall by other than typological evidence" (p. 69). It is observed that, in the Second Period, bonding-courses are used only in a "small class of very careful work" (p. 88; this passage reconciles the conflicting statements on pp. 69 and 252). The presence of such courses is claimed as an indication that the work is not later than Maxentius, which is doubtless valid, and it is hinted that their scarcity is appropriate to his time. But other known Maxentian brickwork contains bonding-courses regularly, as it seems.<sup>9</sup> It would naturally be desirable to make a comparison with brickwork of the time of Probus; but, as far as I am aware, the only piece of architectural construction known to belong to his reign is the "kalybe" at Umm az-Zaitun in Syria,<sup>10</sup> which, though by no means devoid of interest, is not helpful for the Roman wall.

After Richmond wrote, the study of stamped bricks was placed on a new footing by Bloch.<sup>11</sup> In his work it was established that the brick industry was reorganized under Diocletian and that inscribed bricks were made then for the first time since Caracalla. Thus there is likely to be a substantial difference between bricks used in construction just before Diocletian and those used just after him. One brick might exclude Probus as a possible builder, if certainly late and certainly belonging to an unrepared part of the Second Period wall; on the other hand, if there are no recognizably

<sup>6</sup> The lower part was made of stones, re-used and irregular in size, the upper part of concrete. The lower part consists, in some places, of two stone facings with rubble between; in other places the stonework seems to be substantially uniform throughout.

<sup>7</sup> So Mattingly, *CAH*, XII (1939), 310. Arthur Stein (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, VII [1924], 30-51) denied an interregnum of any length.

<sup>8</sup> One would like to cite the account, in Gibbon's chap. xii, of the wall from the Rhine to the Danube; but, as noted in Bury's Appendix 21, there is no ancient basis for it.

<sup>9</sup> Richmond, *op. cit.*, p. 88; Van Deman, *AJA*, 1912, p. 431.

<sup>10</sup> *Princeton Expeditions to Syria*, IIA, Part 5, 361 f. (the building) and IIIA, 5, No. 765<sup>12</sup> (the inscription); Robertson, *Greek and Roman Architecture*, pp. 346, 377; *IGR*, III, 1186.

<sup>11</sup> *I Bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana* (1938); first published as three articles, *Bull. Comm.*, 1936-38.

late bricks in that wall, it should be earlier than Diocletian.

Richmond describes (pp. 58, 60) the wall of the First Period, in which the facing consists largely<sup>12</sup> not of bricks, properly so called, but of broken roof-tiles. On this aspect of the Second Period wall he is less explicit; he says (p. 69) that "the tiles for the facing" are less carefully selected than before and, as already noted, that the two periods must be distinguished by "other than typological evidence." These expressions imply that there is no clear difference between the two periods in the proportion of bricks and roof-tiles; and that is remarkable if the reign of Diocletian came between them.

As for datable bricks, Richmond (p. 251) cites discoveries in three places of examples of one stamp<sup>13</sup> which appears to be later than Diocletian. One of these places is the blocking of Porta Ostiensis West (p. 220). That this

<sup>12</sup> From Richmond's statement one would understand that the facing consists entirely of roof-tiles; but cf. Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 313. I do not understand Richmond to mean that the builders of the wall deliberately followed the authority of Vitruvius (Bloch, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>13</sup> Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 310, No. 1578 (285) (cf. n. 230). Richmond's "first decade of the third century" is, of course, a slip.

blocking is contemporary with the Second Period is only hypothesis. Another is a building outside the wall, on a level which was lowered, apparently in connection with work on the wall; but it is not proved that the structure was built immediately after the lowering of the level or that the level was lowered in connection with work of the Second Period. The third place is a part of the curtain from which the bricks were extracted after its demolition,<sup>14</sup> and it is not certain that they do not belong to repairs later than the Second Period. It seems very probable that, if the work were really Maxentian, Richmond's examination would have revealed more satisfying evidence in the stamped bricks. Diocletianic stamps are reported from the work of Maxentius in the Temple of Venus and Rome, the Circus, and the Basilica.<sup>15</sup>

Until the appearance of a refuting brick, it is suggested that the wall of the Second Period should be regarded as the creation of Probus, surely a more worthy memorial of an able emperor than the vaporous eulogies of "Vopiscus" or the "kalybe" of Umm az-Zaitun.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>14</sup> *NS*, 1889, p. 17. <sup>15</sup> Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars.* By ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. x+488. \$5.00.

"The flowering hedges and trees of the English countryside . . . were heavy with the green of late summer as two men rode their horses along the public way near Lichfield in the Midlands. The elder of the two journeyed slowly and with effort, for his years had long reached the count of seventy. Yet his eyes were still quick and eager, his bearing noble and confident, as of one well accustomed to command. . ." (p. 101). Professor Duckett's book is better than this sort of historical Makart background painting would suggest. Trained in classics, she wrote on Ennius, Vergil, and Catullus before studying the *Latin Writers of the Fifth Century* (1930), passing successfully (1938) through *The Gateway to the Middle Ages* (sixth century), and inching forward—if centuries be inches—to the early medieval *saecula* VII–VIII. It is strange that the Anglo-Saxon saints and scholars should have inspired the author to change her former sober historical style.

Miss Duckett's new book discusses, from a traditional point of view (Roman), in a descriptive and sometimes long-winded fashion (see above), and on the basis of sound scholarship (see the jacket, but also the Bibliography and the full notes useful to all students of that period),<sup>1</sup> the lives of four great Anglo-Saxon churchmen and scholars: Aldhelm of Malmesbury, Wilfrid of York, Bede of Jarrow, and Boniface of Devon, who are passed in review in four chapters of equal length (about one hundred pages each). The reader becomes acquainted, unless he was so before, with the

conditions and circumstances of life of each of those well-known figures. Valuable are some side glances, valuable, too, the numerous vignettes of contemporaries flourishing around the four capital portraits and the integration of those supernumeraries (some of them, e.g., Theodore of Tarsus, men of considerable size and central importance) into the lives of the heroes. This is one of the most attractive and instructive by-products of a book which makes good reading for undergraduates as an introduction into the culture and world of thought of Anglo-Saxon England between 650 and 750.

A crucial problem of historiographic economy is represented by the discussion of the literary works of the four saints and scholars. Depending upon the reader's individual taste, those sections may appear as either too short or too long—too short, because new independent aspects could not have been developed; too long, because they interrupt the narrative which the author intends to offer. Here the historiographic method of surface description lays its snares for the author. The vital problems are by-passed, and the inner tension, or true vitality, of the period remains unnoticed. The author discusses, for example, a great number of those riddles which, on account of their "hidden truth," fascinated people in those days and of which Aldhelm sent a neat hundred to "Acircius," King Aelfred of Northumberland. But in her surface rendering of this work, Miss Duckett disregards the only sentence of Aldhelm's letter to Acircius which discloses what Aldhelm desired to attain to as poet and, probably, made him a poet. For Aldhelm, when discussing metrics in that letter, proudly claims to be the first German to treat this subject ("... constat neminem nostrae stirpis prosapia genitum et Germanicis cunabulis confotum in huiusmodi negotio ante nostram mediocritatem tantopere desudasse priorumque argumenta ingeniorum iuxta metricae artis disciplinam litterarum textui tradidisse"). Aldhelm, in this connection, compares himself *expressis verbis* to Vergil (*Georg.*

<sup>1</sup> There are also two indexes, one "Persons and Places," another "Subjects," not complete (all antique authors are absent in a book on early medieval scholarship!) but not quite worthless. It is puzzling to find that Mahomet, whom one would expect to be a person—or, at least, a place name: Mahomet, Champaign County, Illinois—figures as a "Subject," probably in the sense of "Person of specified, usually undesirable, bodily or mental tendencies."

iii. 11), who took a pride in having introduced pastoral poetry into Roman literature. In this sense Aldhelm feels that he is one who, *princeps ad Italos* (or *Saxones*), has transferred a cultural treasure to his kinsmen. Apparently, Aldhelm considered this the live essence of his calling or "mission," a fact which also changes the perspective of Aldhelm's "Bible poetry" and discloses the life-center of the poet. But Miss Duckett does not evaluate this truly interesting trait. When she writes that "most of this dissertation is of importance only to the historian of metrics" (pp. 49 f.), she shows that she has missed the essential point; and when she adds: "In him we see, too, the pioneer among Latin poets of the Anglo-Saxon race" (p. 50), she proffers as a mere personal opinion what Aldhelm has maintained with the greatest vigor and pride. In a similar way the exceedingly interesting controversy between Celtic and Roman churches, though mentioned by the author, remains flat. She hardly scratches the surface and discloses little of the passions below it, neither the "Cappadocian-Coptic" substratum of the Celtic church in general nor, as Edmund Bishop (*Liturgica historica*, p. 172) once put it, the "ecclesiastical ostracism" and "racial antipathy" with which the Anglo-Roman party discriminated against the Celts.

Perspectives such as these do not require a stepping into greater detail. Professor Duckett offers detail in plenty. But the detail is not reduced to a common denominator or brought into focus, and the weak "Epilogue" completely fails to bind the details together or to brace even the four leading characters by some idea. For it is not enough to say that all four were Anglo-Saxons and "looked upon women with respect." There is a curious thing about historical "details." The late Aby Warburg is credited with having coined the phrase "God dwells in the detail" (*Der liebe Gott wohnt im Detail*). This does not refer to the painting of unrelated details but to the  $\pi\alpha\nu$  which is contained in every  $\psi$ . Wilhelm Levison, in his latest publication (*England and the Continent in the 8th Century* [Oxford, 1946]), which was published too late for use by Miss Duckett, has shown with mastery what ener-

gies a detail may indeed harbor and how even a historical "atom," when scientifically smashed by a scholar who knows, may flash unexpected energies right and left and make the reader quick to hear the crackling under the surface. Miss Duckett's book has its qualities; but never does it break through to the layers beneath the surface, and therefore it does not "crackle."

ERNST H. KANTOROWICZ

University of California

*Storia della letteratura latina.* By ETTORE BIGNONE. Vol. I, 1st ed., 1942; 2d ed., revised, 1946; Vol. II, 1945. Florence: G. C. Sansoni. Pp. xii+599; 470.

This indefatigable scholar, the list of whose publications during the last thirty years as enumerated on the flyleaf totals over eight thousand pages (not counting revised editions and articles in journals), is well known to international scholarship, particularly for his work on the earlier career of Aristotle and on Empedocles and Epicurus, but he has by no means neglected the field of Latin literature. The present volumes are two of a plan contemplating at least four altogether, though on the present scale one more will be required to complete the Republic (p. 597, n.), and they deal with the originality and development of the Roman spirit, as seen in the epic and drama, and with pre-Ciceronian prose and Lucilius, Lucretius, and Catullus.

The work is not drily factual, like Teuffel, nor yet primarily a mixture of historical and bibliographic facts with critical judgments, like Schanz-Hosius; but, without discarding the most essential documentation, it presents in addition translations in prose or verse of many illustrative passages. These are often of considerable length; e.g., in the discussion of Lucretius—the author for whom Bignone evidently feels the greatest admiration—about 48 out of 229 pages are devoted to verse translations. It might be objected that quotations in the original Latin are infrequent and never extended, and at II, 49, the author recognizes the difficulty of adequately rendering in another language the *imperatoria lingua Latina*,

but in partial compensation may be mentioned more detailed stylistic studies of each important author than is customary in general histories of literature, suggestive, at times, of Norden's *Antike Kunstprosa*. Literature, however, for Bignone, is not a mere exposition of dull facts and duller scholarly theories about them, but an enthusiastic unveiling of the beauties of the original, with no accompanying sacrifices to any goddess of conciseness, but in an ecstatic, staccato style, rich in highly colored adjectives and sparse in verbs, and occasionally degenerating (e.g., I, 527; II, 55) into heavy, catalogue-like effects.

Much in this large work, did space permit, might be singled out for commendation or particular attention. I may here merely mention, in passing, Bignone's account of the rural elements in the Latin language, religion, and literature (I, 50 ff.); of the realistic and individualistic traits in Roman life, notably in that of its women as contrasted with Greek *hetærae* (95 ff., 394 ff.); of Horace and Tacitus as two of the most concise writers in the world's literature (147 f.); or his comparison of the legendary sieges of Troy and Veii (154); his analysis—in the style of Norden—of the style of the prose *carmen* (160); his characterization of Livius Andronicus as a *scriba*, Naevius as a *vates*, and Ennius as a *poeta* (278); his insistence on the Empedoclean *Discordia* as a motivation for Ennius's account of the Punic Wars (317); and his remarks on the intimacy of style of Latin epitaphs (404). Similarly, in the second volume may be noted his assertion of the improbability that Cato was ignorant of Greek until his old age (15); the description of Cato's oracular style (19); his recognition that the confused arrangement in the *De agricultura* is probably due to Cato himself (29, n. 1), and that with Cato Roman history becomes really Roman (68); the judgment that Lucilius was primarily a man of action rather than of letters and should accordingly be judged on that basis (82), but that he was also the first really Latin poet of individualism (79); remarks upon the shortness of life of the writers of the age of Catullus—Caesar, Calvus, Lucretius, Sallust, Brutus, *et al.*—(117). The best part of the volume, written

with the most obvious sympathy, is that which treats of Lucretius. From Cicero's famous letter to Quintus, Bignone judges that the neoterics had unfavorably criticized the style of Lucretius, which Cicero and his brother praise and which Marcus contrasts with the unreadable *Empedoclea* of Sallust (162 ff.). Epicureanism he defends as being not ill adapted or contrary to the poetic spirit (203). The threefold division of the *De rerum natura* is emphasized (211)—Books i-ii dealing with matter and space, iii-iv with humanity, and v-vi with the cosmos—and speculations are made (318 ff.) concerning how the poem was to have ended. An appendix (427-43) on the allegorical treatment of Venus in Lucr. i. 1 ff. as representing that *ataraxia* which is found in each of Lucretius's prologues, reviews other theories and is in a distinctly more technical style than is the rest of the work. In the discussion of Catullus, in the last chapter of the first volume, there is much less of original criticism, and one feels at times that it is a little perfunctory, as are—not unnaturally—the treatments of certain of the lesser figures, like the minor historians of the Republic.

Naturally, any reviewer would differ from Bignone at some points, but, on the whole his history is very fair-minded, and—if one may be allowed the oxymoron—rhapsodically sober. Some misprints occur: of Greek words (e.g., I, 389, 737), Latin words (II, 131), and proper names (e.g., "Hergog," II, 388 n.; "Henrickson," II, 447; "Warwington," 455; "Lucretiu's," 457; "Harward," 460; "Paderbom," 464; "Haveloch," 464), the last-mentioned mostly in the twenty-two-page Bibliography). The quality of paper used, bad enough in the first edition, further deteriorates in the second.

The whole work, like some others of modern Italian classical philologists, seems intended for general readers who, though evidently expected not to be in a hurry, do not wish to be impeded by lengthy footnotes—the comparatively few which do appear are largely bibliographic—or by long passages in the original Latin. Its skeleton often seems to derive from Schanz-Hosius, but the author has clothed their conciseness with a considerable amount

of cisalpine adipose. It is to be hoped that the third volume, upon which Bignone was engaged in 1946 (II, xii), may soon see the light, so that leisurely readers may browse happily and profitably among its accounts of Caesar and Cicero.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

*Hellenistic Greek Texts.* By ALLEN WIKGREN, in collaboration with ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL and RALPH MARCUS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947. Pp. xxvi+275. \$3.50.

This book is designed as an introduction to religious literature composed in Greek, or translated into Greek, during the Hellenistic period, which is defined in the Introduction as "between Alexander the Great and Constantine."

The great merit of this anthology is its making accessible numerous selections from authors who, at least in Greek, are missing from so many libraries. For example, it is hardly feasible to equip a class with copies of the Septuagint; yet it is desirable for students to have a taste of it. This is amply provided for in the first two chapters of the present volume with fifty-four pages of selections from historical books, prophets, Wisdom Literature, and apocrypha, including also the *Letter of Aristeas*. The third chapter contains twenty-five pages of New Testament selections. Even less might have been justified, since the New Testament is the most available of all Greek writings. To Philo and Josephus is devoted a brief chapter each, followed by thirty-six pages of patristic literature. However, this covers only about the first fifth of the patristic period and only the more accessible fathers, i.e., passages from each of the following: one letter of Ignatius, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, the *Didache*, First Clement, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Justin's *Apology*, and one apocryphon, the *Acts of Paul*. One could wish for a sampling of Irenaeus, Eusebius, Chrysostom, the Cappadocians, John of Damascus, and the Orthodox liturgy. Of course some of this is post-Constantinian but would be as appropriate as the inclusion of the pre-Alexandrine Xenophon (while omit-

ting Aristotle). Ten pages are devoted to papyri and inscriptions and, finally, about sixty pages to pagan literature, such as Theophrastus, Cleanthes, Epictetus, Pythagoras, Strabo, Arrian (Epictetus), Plutarch, etc.

Of course, there is endless opportunity for quibbling over selections. No anthology can fully satisfy anyone; but where is there anything as good as this volume? Where is there anything at all, except in separate and unrelated volumes and pamphlets? Anyone who has hunted for reading selections with which to introduce students to postclassical Greek will certainly welcome this collection.

The order of selections is partly chronological, partly theological, and partly traditional. No doubt this combination of principles makes the individual selections easier to locate, in the absence of an index, than they would be if arranged chronologically or graded according to difficulty. In some instances none of these principles is followed, as when Ignatius precedes First Clement. The instructors of college and seminary classes will no doubt enjoy choosing their own sequences anyhow.

There are no notes on individual words and statements in the texts, but brief introductions are prefixed to each chapter and to some individual selections.

After the Table of Contents the volume has a good, though not exhaustive, bibliography on Hellenistic culture and religion and on the Greek of the period. Two handbooks of classical Greek grammar are included, but nothing on post-Koine. If a language is being studied historically, and not from a purely practical standpoint, what followed may be just as important as what preceded.

The observation that the Septuagint shows "evidences of an inner Jewish motivation" reminds one that the standard English translations of the Old Testament show equally strong evidences of an inner Christian motivation. Nevertheless, there are passage in both where the translators forgot to be either Jews or Christians and were simply translators. In fact, the Christians made such effective use of certain unguarded Septuagint passages that the Jews finally gave it up and let the Christians have it.

As admitted in the closing sentence of the section on the language, generalizations in the field are extremely dangerous. One of the most dangerous in this introduction is the statement that the vernacular was "limited." This is a popular impression, but almost certainly fallacious. Edward Sapir was on safer ground when he remarked, "All languages are functionally equivalent."

The statement at the top of page xxiii should be qualified to admit that in the inflection of second declension masculines nominative, genitive, and accusative forms are still employed in both singular and plural. Also, the modern Greek still says "I have loosed" with one word, viz., *ἔλυσα*, his language being considerably less analytic than English, though, of course, more so than ancient Greek. Can it be that classicists have a suspicion that synthetic languages are superior? If so, they should take up the study of Eskimo, or one of a number of other so-called "primitive" languages that are far more synthetic than the most ancient Greek known.

The college or seminary student who reads this introduction may get the false impression that the historical use of the present tense and the present meaning of the perfect began with the Koine. It should also be remembered that the increasing use of pronouns and prepositions is not so much a vernacular matter as a part of the general drift of the whole Indo-European family of languages.

In using Rahlfs' text of the LXX the authors are to be commended for not following his annoying practice of leaving the accents off proper names, though they have continued his practice of thus indicating other Hebrew words.

The printing is from a photographic reproduction of typewritten sheets. Someone is to be praised for the skill and drudgery that was necessary to do such beautiful and accurate typing. It seems worthy of a somewhat better quality of paper than that used in this first printing.

Almost any instructor who deigns to recognize educational values in postclassical Greek will want to try this book.

J. MERLE RIFE

Muskingum College

*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, No. 3. Edited for the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, D.C., of Harvard University, by ROBERT P. BLAKE, WILHELM KOEHLER, and PAUL J. SACHS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946. Pp. vi+224+258 figs. \$7.50.

Number 3 of the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* is the first volume in the series to contain solely the work of scholars in residence at the Research Library and Collection in Washington. The four articles prepared in 1942-43 by three Junior Fellows fully live up to the expectations of all who look to Dumbarton Oaks to take the lead in the study of the medieval and Byzantine humanities.

First place in the handsomely bound and printed volume is given to Ernst Kitzinger's treatment of "The Horse and Lion Tapestry," with which the project of giving full publication to the objects in the collection is carried on. The object described is an incomplete polychrome wool textile whose field and broad ornamental frame are completely identical in material and technique. Since the tapestry in composition might be either Mediterranean or Persian in background, the author sets out to determine the distant models and immediate prototypes of its many iconographical motifs. The border, of which only the right-hand section with animals and left-handed hunters in roundels remains, is confidently held to be Coptic work; the field contains repeat elements "all in the ordinary line of Coptic ornamental design." Featured among the latter, however, are half-length addorsed animal protomes in staggered horizontal rows composed alternately of horses and of lions. This distinctive motif is more difficult to isolate, and, in dealing with it, Kitzinger draws the illuminating distinction between animal busts of Persian tradition and half-length animals of Hellenized tradition. A very valuable list of animal and bird capitals of both types from early Christian churches in all parts of the Mediterranean world is appended, with bibliographical references and numerous illustrations. No mention is made of the half-length animals on fifth-sixth-century architectural niches of Ahnas (illustrated in Kitzinger's "Notes on Ear-

ly Coptic Sculpture" *Archaeologia*, Vol. LXXXVII [1937], Pls. LXVIII, LXX), no doubt because they are not strictly addorsed, although the separation may be thought to be greater than that of the capitals only in degree. Everything points to a sixth-century date and to a Coptic provenance for the tapestry as a whole, although the strange manner in which the weaver has drawn the lions of the border with heads almost in profile but with faces full-front is best matched on an Antioch mosaic (*Antioch*, Vol. III [1941], Pl. 76). To state that a consideration of this one small detail is the only omission discovered in Kitzinger's iconographical treatment is to give some indication of the thoroughness with which the ground is covered in this all-important study of Coptic and Sassanian design.

Milton V. Anastos in the short second paper establishes in very positive fashion the Alexandrian origin of the *Christian Topography* of Cosmas Indicopleustes and demonstrates that Cosmas studied under Patricius (Mar Aba) not in Constantinople but in Alexandria. The proof thus supplied that the Antiochene scriptural concept of a flat earth was advanced in the stronghold of Hellenistic materialism substantiates the evidence from the visual arts of a strong spread of Syrian ideas to Egypt in the sixth century.

"A Survey of the Early Christian Town of Stobi," by Ernst Kitzinger, reveals the fruitful nature of that approach to medieval studies proposed by Wilhelm Koehler when he wrote in the *Bulletin of the Fogg Museum of Art* (IX, No. 4 [March, 1941], 83): "It is suggested that Dumbarton Oaks undertake a Census of the monumental material based upon all available publications . . . this information should be kept at the disposal of scholars under the name of Research Archives." Kitzinger's orderly guide to Stobi literature, a good part of which is in Serbian, is the first treatment in English, apart from one brief notice, of the "only place in the Balkans proper which has yielded more than isolated and incoherent remnants both of Roman and Early Christian times," to quote the author. As a result of a conscientious effort, Stobi, "where a Roman road connecting the Via Egnatia is supposed to have crossed the

road north from Salonika," has been put on the archeological map. In the future, this well-illustrated paper will be turned to with gratitude not only by all those who are interested in Stobi with its episcopal church, palace, so-called "Synagogue" complex, city wall, gate, and streets but also by those seeking "a clue to the origins and the earliest history of the art of Byzantium, of which Constantinople itself can tell us so little."

The last paper, "Monte Cassino, Byzantium, and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages," by Herbert Bloch, differs from Kitzinger's "Stobi" in immediate aim and in method. It essays the task of viewing the relations between Byzantium and Monte Cassino "in their whole sweep" by employing a method calling for a removal of "the traditional barriers which separate the various disciplines of history, philology, and history of art." This is the method presently being followed at Dumbarton Oaks; consequently, forthcoming numbers of the *Papers* may be looked forward to with as much expectation as was the present excellent number.

ANDREW S. KECK

American University  
Washington, D.C.

*The Latin Subjunctive*. By S. A. HANDFORD.  
London: Methuen, 1947. Pp. 184. 10s. 6d.

There are few things in any of the IE languages so fascinating as the subjunctive mood in Latin. Nearly a quarter of a century ago Handford and I met briefly (in the Great Western), without discovering this common interest; two years later I had a correspondent (in Georgia) whose monomania was the Latin subjunctive; I used to get two or three letters about it from him by the same mail. Professor Handford, no monomaniac, has bestowed affection upon the subjunctive; but I cannot altogether make out how far his abundant quotations came from his own reading and how far from collections assembled in the larger grammars and treatises. The book covers the usage of the mood from Plautus to Tacitus, and I judge he is thoroughly familiar with that span of Latin authors and has seen nearly all his examples in their contexts. Tacit-

tus is a good point at which to stop, for some degree of confusion is already setting in by then.

Handford's book is a painstaking and accurate survey, with a complete statement of the facts of usage and some, though not very full, discussion of the development of the usage. This seems to have been what he intended. It is, however, disappointing to a comparativist, who would have welcomed more consideration, if not of "origins," at least of the history of constructions in which the subjunctive appears in classical Latin in a way that often departs considerably from the practice in other IE languages. This, in fact, is where the interest of the Latin subjunctive mainly lies; without it, there is a good deal of dull reading in the book, which represents a type of scholarship that became nearly extinct after 1914. If, however, classical scholars in England are again becoming concerned as much with the language as with the subject matter of ancient authors, that is welcome news.

But it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Professor Handford would be out of his depth in historical and comparative problems. Thus he accepts the *qur* of Lindsay's text of Plautus without a qualm. Lindsay printed *qur* even where the manuscripts have *quor* (e.g., *As.* 47 [Handford, p. 67]). He seems to have been misled by *CIL*, I, 2189 (cf. *TLL*, IV, 1438.83). But that inscription is known only from Cod. Vat. 5248, and its *qur* is no more evidence for "OL. *qur*" than the *qur* of other manuscripts, or their *quum* for *cum*. *Qur* is just as barbarous, and for once Lindsay nodded.

Again, Handford writes as if he did not know that classical Sanskrit has no subjunctive mood (except survivals of the first person, used as imperative) or that its optative, strictly so called, is limited to the present tense, with remnants of the subjunctive (Whitney, § 533; Macdonell, *Skt. Gram.* and *Ved. Gram.*, § 122). Again and again he speaks of subjunctive and optative in Skt. without making any distinctions between the earlier and the later language. Then one must deprecate the appeals to metrical convenience (e.g., p. 93); I, too, have tried my hand (cf. p. 46, n. 1) at writing Latin verses. I am sure Handford has a better hand, but Horace and Vergil did not

write "Babu" Latin. It is a poor joke to suppose they preferred a certain tense or mood because they could not manage the Latin language in verse in better style than a modern Latinist. On the other hand, we have—praise be—hardly any appeal to "Greek influence," which, in syntax, is just about as feeble. Handford is right in rejecting Kroll's pernicious doctrines—no better than Sonnenschein's—on the unity of the Latin subjunctive. I wonder whether he knows Hale and Buck's *Latin Grammar*? Its treatment of the subjunctive would have supplied him with some excellent classification—and terminology, too. Similarly, Brugmann's second edition (not mentioned in the Bibliography) marks an advance here and there, in its account of the use of verbal forms, over Delbrück in the first edition. I thought everybody knew that. Buck's *Comparative Grammar* is cited from the first edition, too, which contained not a few slips. The admirable monograph of Brunner (Tübingen, 1936), *Entwicklung der Funktionen der lat. Konjunktion "dum,"* would have helped him across a few thorny places.

Mood is subjective as contrasted with the more objective tense or aspect. Formally they are on the same plane, for tenses in the moods are secondary and usually analogical in the derived languages. So, also, developments in modal usage are largely subjective: in the optative we have both "wish" and "natural likelihood," for the wish is father to the thought; in the subjunctive both "will" and anticipation (jussive, volitive, prospective), as well as "ideal certainty," for necessity is the mother of invention. The ramifications are endless, sometimes tantalizingly obscure, always fascinating. I must not begin to go into details or into detailed criticism of Handford's book. That would take another book of at least the same size. There are many points of detail in which I should not agree altogether, some few in which I should totally disagree, but no positive blunders that I can find. I content myself, therefore, with an expression of gratitude for this useful work of reference—useful to student and teacher alike.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens.* By JOHN S. CREAGHAN and A. E. RAUBITSCHKE. Woodstock, Md.: Theological Studies, 1947. Pp. 54+10 Pls. \$2.50.

Maximum contrast is exhibited between our detailed knowledge of the pagan monuments of classical Athens and our nearly complete ignorance of the Christian monuments of late-antique Athens. This publication of *Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens*, by John S. Creaghan, S.J., and A. E. Raubitschek, of Princeton, is a needed contribution to the dissolution of that regrettable ignorance. It gathers together and reproduces with scholarly commentary the available Christian inscriptions of the epitaph variety from Athens, of pre-Byzantine times. For the most part these monuments date from the fifth century, a crucial transitional period in cultural and ecclesiastical history. Twenty-three of them have been published before. These are subjected to skilful reinterpretation. Thirty-four additional epitaphs, recently uncovered by the Agora excavation of the American School in Athens, are here published for the first time. All these inscriptions are reproduced by colotype from squeezes or photographs that convey excellently the qualities of the originals.

Ten substantial and well-digested introductory sections provide ample information and perspective for the interpretation and evaluation of the inscriptions. These treat of such matters as bibliography, classification, formulas, decorative motifs, spellings, guide lines, shape of monuments, etc. Actually, these sections have character as epilegomena quite as much as prolegomena. They summarize as well as introduce the data provided by the inscriptions.

Specialists other than epigraphists will find valuable matter for consideration in the epitaphs themselves and in the summarizing sections of this volume. Church historians should not miss the phases of religious experience and ecclesiastical organization here recorded. Unless they are exceptionally well informed, they will be surprised at the prominence of the *ἀναγνώστis* and the *περιοδεύτis* in Athenian churches at this time. Similarly, students of art history will be surprised and delighted to meet among Athenian Christians one individu-

al characterized as *τέχνης κεντητῆς καλῶς φρενήσας* and another who was a *σιρικάριος*. The latter, interestingly, was a slave of a very illustrious proconsul. Yet another Athenian Christian was memorialized as a maker of *πινάκες*. Cultivation of the arts was variously represented among the Christians of Athens in the period between Constantine and Justinian.

The major defect of this volume from a scholarly point of view is that it claims too much for Christianity and the Christians. Its pro-Christian bias is evident in the tendency to assert Christian monopoly over certain formulas, together with the concepts or types of experience that they describe; whereas extant evidence does not support the validity of this exclusive claim. Husband-and-wife epitaphs, with the two names connected by *καί*, provide a case in point. Our authors specify this as one of the five major indexes that prove an epitaph to be Christian (p. 13). Say they: "Some of these monuments . . . are dedicated to the memory of husband and wife, whose names are connected by *καί*. This close association of married couples, even in death, seems to be distinctly Christian" (pp. 6 f.). Yet they give no demonstration, positive or negative, of this blanket assertion. Husband-and-wife burials were common practice among pagans and among Jews, in late antiquity, as well as among Christians. Husband-and-wife epitaphs with *καί* are extant in which there is no indication that the deceased were Christians. At least one neutral husband-and-wife inscription, with no Christian identification, is published in this very volume (No. XXIII). A considerable block of consolation epitaphs in Greek specify the togetherness of husband and wife in burial as an alleviation of death. In view of these facts, critical students will challenge the audacious claim of this volume that a husband-and-wife epitaph with *καί* is a demonstration of Christian burial.

For the most part the printed transcriptions of the epitaphs here published have been accomplished with praiseworthy accuracy. In view of the varieties of problems involved, this was a difficult and complicated matter to manage. With emphasis on the fine quality of the general accomplishment, we note two typographical corrections that should have

been made in the interest of exactitude. To give space-and-line relationships correctly, Inscr. XIX b should have been printed at the top of page 34, opposite line 10, instead of at the bottom of page 33 as at present. Throughout the printed record no differentiation is shown between Greek crosses and Latin crosses. They are all given the Western rendering. The collotype plates show that a good majority of them were Greek. The difference should have been rendered in type.

In general, this volume reproduces very well indeed the fascinating source materials with which it is concerned. Since the epitaphs themselves are almost the only original documents we possess concerning Christian life in Athens of the late-antique period, they deserve careful and detailed attention.

HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY

University of Chicago

*Das altrömische eponyme Amt.* By KRISTER HANELL. ("Acta instituti Romani regni Sueciae," Series in 8°, Vol. II.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946. Pp. 226.

This is a serious attempt at a reconstruction of the history of the executive branch in the early Roman constitution through a critical examination of the sources bearing on the *fasti* down to the great reform of 367 B.C. Starting with the perfectly sound thesis that the traditional Roman version of their own history prior to 367 B.C. is a reconstruction based upon very inadequate materials, Hanell points out what most modern writers ignore, namely, that this criticism applies not only to particular incidents but also to the whole interpretation of the constitutional development of the early period. Hence a critical examination of this interpretation is required, and that involves a re-examination of the *fasti consulares*, which are basic for the reconstruction of early Roman history. Here he emphasizes the fact that the *fasti* themselves show obvious traces of emendation and that this emendation was the work of the pontiffs, who were members of the *nobilitas* which governed Rome after 367 B.C. Any reconstruction, therefore, in the preliterate period would naturally be in accordance with the views of the nobility, who

would tend to seek the sanction of antiquity for the institution upon which their position depended, i.e., the dual consulship, and would interpret past constitutional developments from this point of view.

Hanell accepts Nilsson's view that the historic Roman calendar was a combination of a Greek lunar-solar cyclic calendar with one previously in use and that its adoption coincided with the dedication of the Capitoline temple and the founding of the *ludi Romani*. But the use of an eponymous official was a feature of the Greek calendar which was taken over into the Roman calendar from this time on. Here he points out, quite correctly, that an eponymous official is not necessarily the highest political official in his state and that the introduction of a system of dating by eponymous officials does not necessarily involve the creation of a new political office or a political revolution. On the contrary, it would be more natural to select an already existing office for the eponymy. Hence the beginning of the eponymous list in the *fasti* may have no connection with a constitutional reform, as was later believed. This does not, however, affect the general accuracy of the *fasti* as a chronological document.

Examining the *fasti* for the period from the late fifth century to 452 B.C., Hanell points out that the list of dual eponyms shows obvious signs of interpolation and that the interpretation of these officials as pairs of patrician consuls is very suspect. On the basis of the references to a *praetor* in the Twelve Tables; the *lex vetusta* of Livy vii. 3. 5; the tradition of the dedication of the Capitoline temple by Horatius alone; the single eponym of the Forum inscription; and the case of the *foedus Cassianum*, he argues for a single eponymous official during the period in question whose title was, not *dictator* as Beloch claimed, but *praetor maximus*—in Greek στρατηγός ὑπατος. The traditional dual list, he believes, is due to the interpolation of additional names for the glorification of noble families under the theory that the dual consulate from 367 was a restoration of a primitive patrician consulship.

As for the *praetor maximus*, whose title implies at least two other praetors of lower rank, Hanell regards him as the chief military offi-

cial, who, certainly before the introduction of an eponymous calendar year, took over the military duties of the kingship as a stage in the gradual decline of the latter office. This would fit the tradition which attributed both the Capitoline temple and the calendar to a Tarquin, as well as other traditions pointing to the exercise of priestly authority by a Tarquin after 509 B.C. and the absence of any cultural break until well after that date. A change did, however, occur in the character of the eponymous office ca. 451-444 B.C. which reflects a constitutional reform of major significance (cf. the censorship, centuriate organization, etc.). From this date to 367 B.C. the eponymous list is that of the chief magistrates, who are now all of equal rank. Their correct title is *consules*, not *tribuni militum consulari potestate*.

Whether one accepts or rejects Hanell's reconstruction—and he is perfectly aware of the hypothetical character of many of his conclusions—one must admit that he has succeeded in showing that the canonical interpretation of early Roman constitutional history cannot be accepted as fundamentally sound.

A. E. R. BOAK

*University of Michigan*

*A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World, Vol. I: The Orient and Greece to the Partition of the Empire of Alexander the Great.* By C. E. VAN SICKLE. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947. Pp. xvii+630. \$4.50.

The publishers of textbooks have apparently decided that with the end of the war we deserve a new deal all around in texts. Book agents have been abroad in the land, breathing soft encouragement into the ears of would-be authors, and the postwar models have begun to appear. Among the first in ancient history is the present volume, by the lecturer in ancient history at Ohio Wesleyan University. A subsequent volume will deal with Rome and presumably the Hellenistic world, though this era is being unreasonably slighted nowadays.

Professor Van Sickle has divided his space as follows: introductory essay on the sources (18 pp.), early man (15 pp.), ancient Orient to Alexander (123 pp.), the Greek world (344

pp.). Within the Greek world we have Aegean civilization (27 pp.), the Greek "Middle Age" (19 pp.), the "Renaissance" to 500 B.C. (106 pp.), the Persian Wars (41 pp.), the Periclean age (94 pp.), the Peloponnesian War (46 pp.), the fourth century (91 pp.), and Alexander (20 pp.).

The sections on political and economic developments are the most successful. The title of the volume indicates the emphasis, for political history dictates the division into periods, comes first in most sections, and is also very thoroughly treated. Even in such difficult periods as the third millennium B.C. in Mesopotamia, an attempt has been made to provide a consecutive account of political happenings. Among the discussions of economic conditions the section on Hammurabi's Babylon and the incisive account of the Greek economic revival and colonization (chap. xii) stand out. Another excellent analysis occurs in the description of the Athenian political organization in the Periclean age (chap. xxi). Cultural history comes off less well, for it is chopped ruthlessly to fit into the political framework; the development of Greek philosophy, for instance, is given down through Heraclitus in chapter xvi and after a long break resumes with Parmenides in chapter xix. Such a subject cannot be adequately presented when so divided.

One gains the impression from this book that Professor Van Sickle is more interested in fact than in concept. The facts are generally accurate and up to date; they are adequate, often detailed; and they are clearly organized. But I for one miss a treatment of such things as the significance of oriental or Greek history in later civilization. On the crucial question why the Greeks were what they were we are informed (p. 161) that "most of the salient features of the Greek temperament were indigenous and owed their existence to the nature of the country." Later (p. 185) appears the following explanation:

Perhaps the strongest influence exerted by this hard age [the Greek Middle Age] upon the subsequent history of the Greeks was that which it had upon the national temperament. For several centuries poverty and strife ruthlessly eliminated unfit individuals, leaving only the strongest members of each generation to propa-

gate the succeeding one. Ultimately, it produced a hardy race, endowed with strong bodies, clear heads, abundant energy, and indomitable resolution.

The volume is abundantly illustrated with clear maps and well-chosen pictures. The Bibliography (pp. 601-11) is wisely restricted to works in English and is well selected; the Index (pp. 612-30) is satisfactory. The difficulties of present-day bookmaking show up in the rather pedestrian treatment of the illustrations and a few typographical errors, but such things are unavoidable. An Introduction is contributed by Professor T. A. Brady, who is general editor together with William Scott Ferguson.

CHESTER G. STARR, JR.

University of Illinois

*The Forms of Latin.* By ROLAND G. KENT. Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1946. Pp. 138. \$4.00.

In 1946, *Classical Philology* (XLI, 84-90) published an article on Latin noun inflection, a light to lighten the Gentiles. (In passing, note that the author already knew Latin, had even learned it from books written "largely in error"; hence it was no answer to CP, XXXIX [1944], 200.) Now, unfortunately for Professor Kent, he wrote his book before he had had the opportunity to read and benefit from Mr. Hall's article; therefore, "linguists" must condemn it as pre-scientific in its benighted classification of noun-inflections and, by inference, also of verb inflections. For it is a descriptive, as well as a historical, morphology. Here is a nice dilemma for Mr. Kent: either to prefer my praises or to incur Mr. Hall's blame. The only way to rive him from the horns, then, is for me to temper my praises with blame.

*The Forms of Latin* is very precise and correct, and all but unreadable. A beginner will be bewildered, and a scholar not enlightened by a statement such as (p. 21) "Nom.-Acc.-Voc. pl. N.: -ā (-āi in some pronouns) to -o- stems; -ī to -i- stems: -ū to -u- stems, -o to consonantal stems," which is typical, in which "to" is not English, and in which the erratic punctuation (; and : and , all with the same value and, elsewhere, : with another as well) adds to the confusion.

Morphology without syntax is salt without savor. On the same page (21), as a "typical function" of the genitive, is offered the bootless, stale, flat, and unprofitable definition, "the form denoting dependence on another noun"—this is to give a stone to him who asks for bread. There is nothing about compounds, in which Latin is far from poor. Roots appear (e.g., pp. 106-8) in Hirt's formulation, which the revival of the views of De Saussure, under the guise of the "laryngeal hypothesis," has put out of court. The plain fact is that it was the duty of any competent referee to recommend a thoroughgoing revision before publication, not in the direction of palaver about structural analysis, "discontinuous morphemes" (μόρφωμα, not \*μόρφημα), or "immediate constituents," judged by which, as by the canons of "neolinguistics," the work would be hopelessly out of date, but in order to remove idle *ad hoc* explanations (e.g., p. 14 "vulgar N., by influence of Gk. πλήθος," than which a confession of ignorance would be better) or of the constant appeal to metrical convenience (e.g., pp. 41, 50, 119, 125), as if Latin poets wrote Latin verse on the same principles as an English schoolboy. The Faliscan inscription, ID, 312, is cited (p. 54) under the obfuscate reference NSc 1887. 273: Why? Originality is "very limited" (p. 3)—limited, for the most part, indeed, to things that are matters of opinion rather than of fact (e.g., p. 29, gen. sg. -ī; p. 73, *quirquir*, where I prefer Norden's account; p. 74, *alis*, *Cornelis*, where the dialect evidence is against Kent's view; p. 88, Sturtevant's "explanation" of *ā*, *ē*, were better forgotten; p. 127, does -r replace "the final consonant which is the personal ending of the active" in Umb. *ferar*? The subj. 3 pl. ends in -ns, Umb. also -s, but in what sense are we to understand that -r replaces -s?). It is as futile, however, to argue about opinion as about taste. But the matter of *tinguo*, *tingo* (p. 111) is a matter of fact (see Sommer, p. 188). Misprints are not very frequent (p. 100, *fieri* for *fieri*; p. 105, ἡγεγον for ἡνεγον; p. 121, 2d plu. active ending -e, Skt. *vidā*, has dropped out—these I mention in passing); references to dissertations by Kent's pupils or former pupils are too frequent. But it would be unkind to continue like this, as I see, from my marked

copy, that I could. Kent's *Forms*, like the *Sounds*, contains orthodox doctrine, succinctly stated, on everything that falls within its scope (except compounding, cf. the famous *Outline*, p. 61). It will be a useful reference book for those who know enough to use it wisely.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Aegyptus: Rivista italiana di egittologia e di papirologia*, Vol. XXV (1945). Milano: Soc. editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1946. Pp. 148.

The *amicitia papyrologorum*, forged by the masters and loyally maintained by their pupils and successors, has long been famous. Few disciplines have known as much real cordiality and friendship among their widely scattered disciples, and the well-attended series of five international congresses made it possible for papyrologists to come to know one another personally. Surviving the passions and destruction of war, this sentiment already gives rise to talk of another meeting, almost before we have taken stock of the changes which occurred during these terrible six years. The loss of Wilcken is one which will never be made good, but Schubart lives, and it is reported that the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* will resume publication. Grievous is the loss, in France, of Collomp, Collart, and Germaine Rouillard, but Jouguet is as active as ever. The loss of Crum is irreparable; but Hunt and Bell still guide us, and, in Austria, Wenger, in retirement, remains the great successor of Mitteis in our legal studies. In America, with the magnificent staff of the University of Michigan in the lead, our losses have hardly included even the loss of time. But Italy has done equally well under much more difficult circumstances.

In this mood of stocktaking and resumption of contacts, the arrival of the first postwar issue of *Aegyptus* is doubly welcome. It comes as a sign of normalcy, as a harbinger of the new spring season of our studies. Throughout the years, Aristide Calderini has continued to maintain the journal as an indispensable aid and vehicle of our studies. Its hospitable pages have continued to welcome contributions from every quarter and in any readily understood language, while the systematic studies of his own school at Milan have worked away to

bring system and order into the field of papyrological concerns. It has furnished not only a full bibliography of papyrological publications but a catalogue of all published papyri, the serial numbers of which now reach 6,257. It was one of the very few European journals to publish on schedule through the war and, in spite of the destruction in Milan at the end, survived in reasonable condition, neither the institute nor the printed stocks being destroyed.

The substance of this twenty-fifth volume is worthy of its tradition. Angelo Segrè contributes a note on metrology, and a long study of that important and much-vexed question, the nature of Greco-Roman law following the Antonine Constitution. Cesarina Pacchi writes interestingly on the activities of Ippolito Rosellini as Librarian at Pisa, and Silvio Furlani examines the relations between Hittites and Egyptians between 1500 and 1200 B.C. according to the conception of a balance of power. But greatest interest inevitably attaches to the five reports on papyrology during the war, by Bell, Boak, Hombert-Préaux, Van Groningen, and Olsson, which give both bibliography and personnel. More recently, Hombert and Préaux, in their own *Chronique d'Égypte*, have gone a little further, but the picture is not yet complete. It is to be hoped that Calderini will proceed to finish the survey, especially including Egypt and the countries of eastern Europe, which are also valued members of the family of papyrological investigators.

C. BRADFORD WELLES

Yale University

*Les grands mythes de Rome*. By JEAN HUBAUX. ("Mythes et religions.") Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1945. Pp. viii+156.

The title of this excellent booklet is somewhat misleading: genuine myths, like those of the Greeks and Polynesians, Rome never had. What she did have was a long series of prophecies—all of learned and oriental origin—touching her own destiny. The fear of the ultimate finiteness of both city and empire never left the Roman mind, and the very expression *Urbs aeterna* is a sort of optimist reaction or protest against the prevailing feeling of alarm.

The present study, which pursues this tradition *ab urbe condita* to the days of Augustine, is an outgrowth and an elaboration of a masterly article by our common teacher, the unforgettable Salomon Reinach (*Cultes, mythes et religions*, III, 302 ff.).

The charm of the booklet is enhanced by the author's observations in the domain of the philosophy of history. Thus on page 73 he discusses, after Livy, the question of what would have happened had Alexander, instead of turning to the Orient, invaded Italy. With Livy our author concludes, most properly, that the Macedonian "man on horseback" might very well have won a battle or two (as did Pyrrhus in the next generation) but would never have been able to master the sound and as yet incorrupt republic with its excellent institutions and its senate, an assembly of kings.

The keenness of the Roman sense of finiteness is recalled in that magnificent story told by Polybius: Scipio, beholding the flames of Carthage, cites the verses of the *Iliad* in which Hector gravely forecasts the doom of Troy: "There will come the day when Ilion the Holy will perish, with Priamus and his people of heroes." And on Polybius' asking the victor what he meant, Scipio replied that it was of Rome that he was thinking, of Rome, whose turn would also come, as is bound to happen with all things terrestrial. That was a fine example of humanism, of the *magnitudo animi*. If our atomic bombers voiced similar sentiments over the ruins of Hiroshima, history has failed to record the fact.

Finally, there is an altogether pleasing chapter on that truly great statesman, the Emperor Augustus, the second founder of Rome, whom certain pseudo-historians of our time have chosen to call a "Fascist." His "Fascism" comes out best in his wise remark quoted by Suetonius (*Aug.* 25): "Proelium quidem aut bellum suscipiendum omnino negabat, nisi cum maior emolumentum spes quam damni metus ostenderetur. Nam minima commoda non minimo sectantis discrimine similes aiebat esse aureo hamo piscantibus, cuius abrupti damnum nulla captura pensari posset." Would that our modern Fascists had followed such maxims! Nor did the emperor stand alone in holding this view. Horace, to

be sure, liked Rome; but he, too, liked the Romans more and held that it is better to live than to die for one's country, or, as that *esprit moqueur* Heinrich Heine was to express it:

Leben bleiben wie das Sterben  
Für das Vaterland ist süß.

All in all, an excellent book and one which Salomon Reinach would have approved of!

†ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

*Princeton, New Jersey*

*Selections from the Greek Elegiac, Iambic, and Lyric Poets.* By J. A. MOORE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. 112.

This book is modestly described by the editor as "essentially a revision of *Selections from the Elegiac, Iambic, and Lyric Poets for the Use of Students in Harvard University*, originally made by H. M. Morgan,<sup>1</sup> and revised by C. B. Gulick." Since, however, various changes have been made in selection, and a new set of notes has been written, it may be considered as a new textbook. Mr. Moore, with some carrying over from the former edition, offers nearly fifty pages of Greek verse which can be studied, with pleasure and profit, by students who have had relatively little previous training in Greek. To that end, it would seem, he has considered in his selection not only intrinsic merit or interest but also relative clearness and simplicity, since only thus can we account for the omission of Aleman's "Maiden Song." In the notes, controversy has been avoided, and their purpose is plainly that of assisting the student, not perplexing him with detail. Breaks in papyrus are indicated in the conventional manner, but manuscript alternatives or corruptions are not; so, e.g., in Archilochus 58.1 (numbers follow Diehl) *τίθει ἀπάρτα* is read, and there is no comment in the notes, all such cases being covered by a very general statement in the Preface. Also, there is no acknowledgment that the authorship of, e.g., Simonides 92 or 105 is anything less than certain. This is, perhaps, to be too brief. On the other hand, the quality of the notes is exceedingly good; they are concise, lucid, often witty, and

<sup>1</sup> Read M. H. Morgan.

straight to the point. This is particularly true of Solon 1 and Simonides 4.

As for omissions, it is inevitable that any particular reviewer will find some items left out which he would like to see included. The most striking omission, after Aleman's "Maiden Song," is perhaps that of Semonides 7, although this is comprehensible on grounds of taste. The absence of any reference to the Palinode of Stesichorus is harder to understand. Also, apart from the reviewer's particular prejudices, there is a certain general drift to the omissions. Not only is there no Semonides 7, there is no Semonides. Hipponax is represented by only one fragment, of doubtful authenticity (Diehl's *Adesp. Chol.* 1), and the student will not observe the poet removing his coat in order to hit Bupalus in the eye. The "ferocity" of Archilochus might have been illustrated by the inclusion of 79. With Anacreon's "Artemon" (54) omitted, only the sepulchral epigram, 101, keeps that poet from being shown as exclusively pretty and playful, despite the leer in 5 ("not a pleasant poem," says the editor). In short, the tendency toward invective occasionally indulged in throughout the work of these poets (even Sappho) has been somewhat obscured, and there is a general softening effect. But this is, after all, only a slight and perhaps carping objection to an excellently chosen and annotated selection.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE

Bryn Mawr College

*Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius.* By ANDRÉ LAMBERT. Doctoral dissertation. Zürich, 1946. Pp. 80.

The author maintains, not without reason, that Livy's use of shorter or longer speeches as reported in indirect discourse has received relatively little attention. He shows that these, stylistically, are as carefully elaborated as are the speeches delivered in the first person and that they were first used by the historian to describe particular episodes and moods. He also contrasts Livy's method briefly with that of Polybius, Sallust, and Caesar. Much of the dissertation inevitably has become a list of short or longer quotations followed by comment or comparison. Some of Lambert's ob-

servations are helpful, some are rather trifling. His most valuable contribution is to show how Livy, who wished to write as impersonally as possible, in this respect resembling Thucydides, and at the same time to stimulate the imagination of his readers by bringing before them vividly the feelings and reactions of individuals and groups, achieved his purpose by the infinitely varied and skilful use of this stylistic device. At the same time he has to admit (p. 44) that no general rule governing all its manifold applications can be drawn up. When he refers (pp. 13-14) to Livy's restraint in alluding to deeds of violence and horror, he might have added that the historian shows the same trait in straight narrative. His attitude, moreover, contrasts strongly with that of Polybius and especially of Tacitus, who both dwell on the crasser details of violence and war. The chapter in which he compares certain passages of Polybius with those in Livy based on the Greek writer merely proves what is sufficiently obvious, that Livy was a greater artist. In his brief discussion of Sallust (pp. 66-68) Lambert confines his attention to the *Jugurtha* and the *Catiline*. Yet the passage in *Hist.* ii, Fragment 87 (Maurenbrecher), is not without interest. Sallust momentarily puts himself in the place of one group of persons but then himself reports the feelings of another group: "[iuniores] tumultum faciunt, neque se arma neque socios dum animae essent proditores firmabant. At illi quibus aetas imbellior . . . cupere pacem . . . metuere." It is legitimate to wonder whether Sallust in his last and maturest work did not make a more varied use of speeches in indirect discourse than in his two monographs.

This is a competent investigation; but one could wish that its author, who is clearly a young scholar of promise, had been advised to take as his theme a topic of somewhat wider scope and deeper significance.

M. L. W. LAISTNER

Cornell University

*Les Origines de Rome.* By RAYMOND BLOCH. ("Que sais-je?" No. 216.) Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1946. Pp. 126.

Limited to Rome, this pocket-sized manual vies neither with my *Foundations* nor even with Altheim's *Grundlagen* (the imitative title that flatters); on a smaller scale than Piganiol's *Essai* (1917), it has the advantage of thirty years of discovery, or at least of surmise and hypothesis. There is no bibliography to speak of (a few French and Italian works; Schulze's *Eigennamen* and perhaps one or two other German)—not that it matters in a booklet to inform those who ask themselves the question "Que sais-je?" Bloch leans heavily on Dumézil's theories, which turn the legends of primitive Rome into forgotten IE myths. History often becomes mythical, but Dumézil turns mythology into history, a modern euhemerism.

Pages 22, 113: Collatinus is twice named as first consul (with Brutus), with no mention of Publius Valerius. Page 39 (cf. 48): "La tradition désigne du nom de Ligures et Sicules les habitants de l'Italie préaryenne." Tradition does no such thing. Where does tradition mention IE (or Aryan)? Page 45: the vulgar errors *Bruttium*, and (p. 79) *Caius*, which is not "emprunté au grec Γαῖος," persist. Page 49: Jupiter is more often *Latiaris* than *Latialis* (is). Page 49, n. 1: What is *Revue philologique*? I suppose *de philologie*? And the guess, perhaps not hinted here, but explicit in Rhys Carpenter's recent book, that connects *Troia* and *Etruscus*, will need positive proof that *Troia* stands for \**Tros-ia*. Page 50 (cf. 91): Herbig's contention that all these names in *-al* (Palatual, etc.) show Etruscan influence, was worth mention. In note 1, *Antichità* needs an accent. Page 52: Why are the Sabines "un élément préaryen"? Page 53, note 2: For 41 read VI. Page 58: This is important—the archeological proof of archaic Greek influence in Latium; and also (pp. 59–60) the Etruscan creation of a city (*urbs*) out of a collection of hamlets. As for the etymology of *urbs*, I think it means "Watertown, Waterbury" or the like (cf. *Vrba*, etc. Holder *AcS*, III, 35–36; Walde-Pokorny, I, 268, *yer-*, *ūr-*). Page 83: I cannot agree that the Apollo of Veii is "beautiful"—not my idea of "beauty," except ironically, at all. Page 95: The prevailing view of *Iuno* lays much stress on *mea Iuno*; well, what about *Mars suus* (*CIL*, XIII, 1353), *matres meae* (*ibid.*, 8224)?

Or on the plural *Iunones*, what about *Eponae* (*CIL*, III, 7904), *Minervae* (XIII, 4475)? This is but one argument of many against *iuno*, "female genius."

The book stops at the end of the fourth century B.C. I have enjoyed reading it, but I do not think I learned anything from it.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Die Entdeckung von Europa durch die Griechen.*

By MARTIN NINCK. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1945. Pp. 287. \$4.25. Order from Albert J. Phiebig, Suite 1209, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

This book describes the process by which the Greeks developed their knowledge of the various parts of Europe not only in the field of geography but in anthropology as well. There are eight chapters: (i) "Zur Einführung," (ii) "Der Name Europa," (iii) "Wandlungen im Weltbild der Griechen," (iv) "Die Entdeckung des Ostens," (v) "Griechenland und Kreta," (vi) "Italien und die Inseln des westlichen Mittelmeers," (vii) "Die Entdeckung des Westens," and (viii) "Die Erforschung des Nordens." The first chapter stresses the versatility and intellectual keenness with which the Greeks explored these subjects, in contrast to the Romans and other ancient peoples. The third chapter reviews the steps by which the problems of the shape, size, and position of the earth and the *oikumene* were solved. The fourth is chiefly a geographical and archeological discussion of Herodotus' account of the Scythians. The fifth consists of quotations of Ephorus on Crete, Pseudo-Dicaearchus on the Greek cities, and Strabo on Corinth, with remarks. The treatment is semipopular, competent, appreciative, and interesting, but quite secondary, yielding nothing original or new. In interpreting Posidonius' and Ptolemy's circumference of the earth (pp. 61 f., 77), the author should at least have recognized the possibility that Posidonius merely converted stades of 10 to a mile to stades of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  to a mile, so that his 180,000 would be practically equivalent to Eratosthenes' 250,000. The documentation is adequate, but

the Bibliography is almost all in German. The discussion of Pytheas of Marseilles (pp. 218-26) would have profited greatly by consulting Vilhjalmur Stefansson's *Ultima Thule* (1940). The book is very nicely printed. There are thirty-six figures, including six plates.

AUBREY DILLER

Indiana University

*The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555.* By MARVIN T. HERRICK. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXXII, No. 1.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. viii + 117. \$1.50.

Mr. Herrick uses chiefly the works of Robertellus, Madius, and Philippus, close contemporaries in the sixteenth century. He shows the supremacy of Horace and the secondary rank of Aristotle in the critical work of the period, an order that was, of course, to be reversed by the time of Dryden and Dennis. Mr. Herrick indicates how the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* as they became known in translations were used as commentaries on the *Ars poetica*, and how the necessary reconciliations were made. The topic headings are: "Nature and Art," "Poetic Imitation," "Function of Poetry," "Decorum," "Epic vs. Tragedy," "Dramatic Rules." This is a thorough and readable study. It is startling to find no "Aristotle" in the Index and no reference to Horace's second book of epistles, which reveals much of Horace's position in general and in detail. On page 29, line 4, *hince* appears to be an error.

H. L. TRACY

Queen's University

*De Godenschildering in Ovidius' Metamorphosen.* By J. C. ARENS. Nijmegen: Drukkerij Gebr. Janssen, 1946. Pp. xii + 192.

The present work, a dissertation accepted by the Roman Catholic University of Nijmegen, purports to give a complete account of Ovid's views of the Olympians as presented in his *Metamorphoses*. A summary of the existing literature beginning with E. Rohde (1876) is followed by a chapter on the peculiar character

of Ovid's muse, bringing out the important fact that the poet is throughout dominated by purely aesthetic preoccupations. This preamble precedes a clear analysis of the various episodes dealing with the "private lives" of the Olympians: their petty rivalries and jealousies and their interference with the lives of mortals.

In conclusion Ovid's dependence on the Alexandrians is analyzed under the following subjects: anthropomorphism, modernization, treatment of eponymous deities (personifications), points of difference between Ovid and the Homeric-Hesiodic traditions, use of humor and irony, etc.

While the loss of most of Ovid's sources makes a detailed comparison impossible, still the few cases where such a comparison is practicable, e.g., where Ovid imitates Nicander, Callimachus, and Vergil, show that the Roman poet was no slavish imitator but that he displays considerable originality in modifying, adapting, and combining his sources. It would be interesting to determine how much Ovid's training for the bar contributed to give his poetry that peculiar slant: a lively and scintillating humor, very much less pronounced (so far as one may form a judgment from the extant materials) in his Greek models.

†ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, New Jersey

*Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina.* By J. VAN OOTEGHEM. 2d ed., rev. and enl. ("Éditions de la revue *Les Études classiques*." ) Namur. n.d. Pp. 387.

This excellent bibliography will serve three useful purposes: (1) it will prepare graduate students in the classical field for the Doctor's examination; (2) it will put comparative students in contact with the essential critical material dealing with any given classical author; and (3) it will be of much assistance to librarians trying to build up a fair classical library with limited budgetary resources.

Though written in French, the bibliography shows no noticeable bias: English and German works loom quite as large as do the French.

†ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, New Jersey

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- AMMENDOLA, GIUSEPPE (ed.). *Eschilo, Le Coefore: Introduzione, testo e commento*. ("I Classici della nuova Italia," ed. CARLO GALLAVOTTI, No. 18.) Firenze: La nuova Italia, 1948. Pp. 204.
- ANTI, CARLO. *Guida per il visitatore del teatro antico di Siracusa*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1948. Pp. 119. L. 220.
- BRÉGUET, ESTHER. *Le Roman de Sulpicia: Élégies IV, 2-12 du "Corpus Tibullianum"*. Genève: Georg & Cie (Librairie de l'Université), 1946. Pp. 352.
- CHRMES, K. M. T. *The "Respublica Lacedaemoniorum" Ascribed to Xenophon: Its Manuscript Tradition and General Significance*. ("Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester," No. 1.) Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1948. Pp. vi+48. 7s. 6d. net.
- DALE, A. M. *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1948. Pp. viii+220. \$4.00.
- DIRINGER, DAVID. *The Alphabet: A Key to the History of Mankind*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. 607. \$12.00.
- EARP, F. R. *The Style of Aeschylus*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1948. Pp. viii+175. \$3.00.
- GALLAVOTTI, CARLO. *La Lingua dei poeti eolici con appendice metrica*. (MOTCIKAI ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΟΙ, diretta da C. GALLAVOTTI, No. 3.) Bari: Adriatica editrice, 1948. Pp. 139.
- GOGGIN, SISTER THOMAS AQUINAS. *The Times of Saint Gregory of Nyssa as Reflected in the Letters and the Contra Eunomium*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXXIX.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xxiv+217.
- GOLDSCHMIDT, VICTOR. *Le Paradigme dans la dialectique platonicienne*. ("Bibliothèque de philosophie contemporaine: Histoire de la philosophie et philosophie générale.") Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1947. Pp. iv+139. Fr. 150.
- . *Les Dialogues de Platon: Structure et méthode dialectique*. ("Bibliothèque de philosophie contemporaine: Histoire de la philosophie et philosophie générale.") Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1947. Pp. xii+376. Fr. 400.
- HERMATHENA, No. LXXI (May, 1948). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.
- HUMANITAS, Vol. I. Coimbra: Faculdade de letras da Universidade de Coimbra (Instituto de estudos clássicos), 1947.
- JENSEN, POUL JOHS. *Plotin*. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1948. Pp. 217. Kr. 10.
- LEGRAND, PH.-E. (ed. and trans.). *Hérodote, Histoires, livre VI (Érato)*. ("Collection des universités de France.") Paris: Les belles lettres, 1948.
- MARMORALE, ENZO V. *La Questione petroniana*. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna," No. 44.) Bari: G. Laterza & Figli, 1948. Pp. 332. L. 1100.
- MARROU, HENRI-IRÉNÉE. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1948. Pp. 595.
- OLMSTEAD, A. T. *History of the Persian Empire [Achaemenid Period]*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. Pp. xx+576+70 pls. \$10.00.
- PEPE, LUIGI. *Tibullo minore*. Naples: Casa editrice Armanni, 1948. Pp. xii+159. L. 700.
- PHOIBOS, Vol. II (1947-48), Fasc. 1. Bruxelles: Université libre de Bruxelles.
- STRZELECKI, LADISLAUS. *De Ateio Capitone nuptialium caerimoniarum interprete*. ("Travaux de la Société des sciences et des lettres de Wrocław," Ser. A, No. 9.) Breslau: J. Lacha, 1947. Pp. 27.
- TACCONE, ANGELO (ed.). *Sofocle, Filottete*. ("I Classici della nuova Italia," ed. CARLO GALLAVOTTI, No. 17.) Firenze: La nuova Italia, 1948. Pp. iv+172.
- WEHRLI, FRITZ (ed.). *Die Schule des Aristoteles*:

- Texte und Kommentar*, Heft 3: *Klearchos*. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co. Verlag, 1948. Pp. 85. Paper, Swiss fr. 11. American representative: Albert J. Phiebig, Suite 1209, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.
- WESTERINK, LEENDERT GERRIT. *Michael Psellus "De omnifaria doctrina": Critical Text and Introduction*. (Dissertation, Nijmegen, 1948.) Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij N.V., 1948. Pp. vi+111.
- WILI, WALTER. *Horaz und die augusteische Kultur*. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co. Verlag, 1948. Pp. 414. Bound, Swiss fr. 28. Imported by Grune & Stratton, Inc., Medical Publishers, New York, N.Y.
- WINNINGTON-INGRAM, R. P. *Euripides and Dionysus: An Interpretation of the Bacchae*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1948. Pp. viii+190. \$3.50.

# INDEX TO VOLUME XLIII

- Alcaeus of Messene, epigrams, discussed 116 ff.
- Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazuse*, parodies of Euripides 174 ff.
- Boccaccio, and Cassinese manuscripts of Laurentian Library 217 ff.
- Book Reviews:
  - Aegyptus*, Vol. XXV (Welles) 276
  - The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*, Vol. I (Stuart) 64
  - Arens: *De Godenschildering in Ovidius' Metamorphosen* (†Krappe) 280
  - Aymard: "A propos de quelques monnaies romaines du musée Saint-Raymond," etc. (Larsen) 139
  - Baynes: *The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome* (Boak) 69
  - Bignone: *Storia della letteratura latina* (Pease) 266
  - Bloch: *Les Origines de Rome* (Whatmough) 278
  - Boyce: *Coins of Tingi with Latin Legends* (Howe) 214
  - van den Bruwaene: *Études sur Cicéron* (Katz) 66
  - Carpenter: *Observations on Familiar Statuary in Rome* (Johnson) 52
  - Christopher (trans.): *St. Augustine: The First Catechetical Instruction* (Green) 65
  - Creaghan and Raubitschek: *Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens* (Willoughby) 272
  - Delcourt: *Oedipe, ou la légende du conquérant* (Daly) 47
  - Delvoye: *Bibliographie archéologique pour les professeurs de langues et d'histoire anciennes* (Johnson) 142
  - Duckett: *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars* (Kantorowicz) 265
  - Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, No. 3 (Keck) 269
  - Dunkin: *Post-Aristophanic Comedy: Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at Both Athens and Rome* (Post) 210
  - Ernout: *Philologica* (Whatmough) 208
  - Festugière: *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, Vol. I: *L'Astrologie et les sciences occultes* (Walton) 56
  - Frankfort et al.: *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man: An Essay on Speculative Thought in the Ancient Near East* (Bickerman) 58
  - Frisch: *Cicero's Fight for the Republic: The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics* (Oldfather) 211
  - Handford: *The Latin Subjunctive* (Whatmough) 270
  - Hanell: *Das altrömische eponyme Amt* (Boak) 273
  - Heinimann: *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Greene) 136
  - Herrick: *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555* (Tracy) 280
  - Herter: *Platons Akademie* (Cherniss) 130
  - Hubaux: *Les grands mythes de Rome* (†Krappe) 276
  - Hutton: *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800* (Oliver) 132
  - Jensen: *Det latinske Perfektsystem* (Whatmough) 140
  - Jones: *Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece: With an Edition of Περὶ ἀρχαῖς ἰητρικῆς* (Couch) 134
  - Kent: *The Forms of Latin* (Whatmough) 275
  - Kleist (trans.): *The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, Newly Translated and Annotated* (Casey) 70
  - Knox: *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (Nock) 122
  - Lambert: *Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livi*us (Laistner) 278
  - Lattimore: *The Odes of Pindar* (Norwood) 60
  - Louis: *Les Métaphores de Platon* (Berry) 63
  - Marmorale (ed.): *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis* (Whatmough) 204
  - Moore: *Selections from the Greek Elegiac, Iambic, and Lyric Poets* (Lattimore) 277
  - Mylonas: *The Hymn to Demeter and Her Sanctuary at Eleusis* (Amix) 67
  - Ninck: *Die Entdeckung von Europa durch die Griechen* (Diller) 279
  - Numismatic Literature*, No. 1 (Howe) 214
  - van Ooteghem: *Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina*, 2d ed. (†Krappe) 280
  - Paratore (ed.): *Virgilio Eneide, libro quarto* (Pease) 212
  - Piganiol: *L'Empire chrétien (325-395)* (Vasiliev) 51
  - Rand et al. (eds.): *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen II* (Bruère) 126
  - Robertson (ed.) and Vallette (trans.): *Apulée: Les Métamorphoses* (Perry) 192
  - Robinson: *Alexander the Great* (Griffith) 200
  - Skard: *The Use of Color in Literature* (Pease) 142
  - Strömberg: *Greek Prefix Studies: On the Use of Adjective Particles* (Poultney) 137

- Sturtevant: *An Introduction to Linguistic Science* (Bolling) **68**  
 Svennung: *Compositiones Lucenses* (Dillon) **213**  
 Thompson: *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Laistner) **205**  
 Thomsen: *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasions* (McGeachy) **201**  
 Tod: *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 2d ed. (Larsen) **142**  
 Van Sickle: *A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World*, Vol. I: *The Orient and Greece to the Partition of the Empire of Alexander the Great* (Starr) **274**  
 Wehrli (ed.): *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*, Heft I: *Dikaiarchos*; Heft II: *Aristoxenos* (De Lacy) **207**  
 West and Johnson: *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (Broughton) **61**  
 Wikgren et al.: *Hellenistic Greek Texts* (Rife) **268**
- Books Received **71, 143, 215, 281**
- Catullus, life, chronology of **42 ff.**  
 Cicero, *Ad Atticum* vi. 1. 15, discussed **187 ff.**; medieval manuscripts of **190 f.**  
*CIL*, III, p. 948, No. X, discussed **231 ff.**  
 Euripides, *Telephus*, influence on Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* **174 ff.**  
*exempla*, in Latin Christian apologists **93 ff.**  
*fortitudo*, pagan examples of, in Latin Christian apologists **93 ff.**  
 Greek history **73 ff., 116 ff., 145 ff., 187 ff.**  
 Greek language **243 ff.**; cf. also *sophrosyne*  
 Hadoard **190 f.**  
 Horace, relation to Propertius **105 ff.**  
 Lupus of Ferrière **190 f.**  
 Lysander **145 ff.**  
 paleography, Latin **31 ff., 217 ff.**  
 papyri, Indiana University papyri **110 ff.**  
 Philip II of Macedon **73 ff.**  
 Philip V of Macedon, and Alcaeus of Messene **116 ff.**  
 Pindar, style **25 ff.**  
 Plato, *Critias*, the numbers in, discussed **40 ff.**  
 Procopius, *De aedificiis* i. 4. 3, discussed **44 f.**  
 Propertius, relation to Horace **105 ff.**  
 reading, in antiquity **184 ff.**  
 Reviewers:  
 Amyx **67**  
 Berry **63**  
 Bickerman **58**  
 Boak **69, 273**  
 Bolling **68**  
 Broughton **61**  
 Bruère **126**  
 Casey **70**  
 Cherniss **130**  
 Couch **134**  
 Daly **47**  
 De Lacy **207**  
 Diller **279**  
 Dillon **213**  
 Green **65**  
 Greene **136**  
 Griffith **200**  
 Howe **214 (bis)**  
 Johnson **52, 142**  
 Kantorowicz **265**  
 Katz **66**  
 Keck **269**  
 †Krappe **276, 280 (bis)**  
 Laistner **205, 278**  
 Larsen **139, 142**  
 Lattimore **277**  
 McGeachy **201**  
 Nock **122**  
 Norwood **60**  
 Oldfather **211**  
 Oliver **132**  
 Pease **142, 212, 266**  
 Perry **192**  
 Post **210**  
 Poultney **137**  
 Rife **268**  
 Starr **274**  
 Stuart **64**  
 Tracy **280**  
 Vasiliev **51**  
 Walton **56**  
 Welles **276**  
 Whatmough **140, 204, 208, 270, 275, 278**  
 Willoughby **272**  
 Roman army, training of recruits **157 ff.**  
 Rome, walls, discussed **261 ff.**  
 Seneca, *Ep.* 14. 8, discussed **46**; 17. 6, discussed **18**; 23. 10, discussed **18 f.**; 26. 8, discussed **19**; 47.5, discussed **19**; 47. 8, discussed **19 f.**; 59. 15, discussed **20**; 68. 14, discussed **20**; 76. 16, discussed **20 f.**; 78. 3, discussed **21**; 78. 8, discussed **21**; 78. 17, discussed **21 f.**; 82. 14, discussed **22**; 88. 17, discussed **22 f.**; 88. 30, discussed **23**; 89. 15, discussed **23 f.**; 89. 20, discussed **24**; 101. 2, discussed **24**; 114. 21, discussed **24**; 119. 10, discussed **24**; 123. 4, discussed **24**  
*sophrosyne*, in Greek literary criticism **1 ff.**  
 Sparta **145 ff.**





# The Herbal of Rufinus

LYNN THORNDIKE

By

Assisted by

FRANCIS BENJAMIN, JR.

the first printing  
from the only extant  
manuscript, now in  
Florence, of Rufinus,  
"the forgotten botan-  
ist of the thirteenth  
century."

More than any other herbalist of the Middle Ages, Rufinus was interested not so much in the medicinal qualities of herbs as in the plants themselves: careful detailed descriptions of the stalks, leaves, and flowers, identification of different varieties, and careful checking of many names often applied to a single plant are some of the unusual features in this history of medieval botany. \$5.00

UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO PRESS



TWO VOLUMES

## THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE FROM HOMER TO ARISTOTLE

By ROBERT J. BONNER and GERTRUDE SMITH

### VOLUME I

"Regarded as a reference book it is excellent, for it not only cites the sources but, in important cases, reproduces them, while its collection of modern critical material will be a great convenience to those who wish to pursue some particular problem."—*Classical Journal* \$4.00

### VOLUME II

"The book presents a vivid picture of the place of the legal system in Athenian life and politics. It thus contributes not only to the study of legal antiquities but also to the understanding of an important phase of Athenian democracy. Those who, acquainted with the first volume, will expect to find in the second lucid exposition, cogent reasoning and judicious conjecture without dogmatism, will not be disappointed."—H. G. ROBERTSON, *Classical Weekly* \$3.50

"Volumes I and II . . . belong in the front rank of the scholarly and learned writings of the world."—ALFRED P. DORJAHN, *Classical Philology*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

PADRAIC COLUM—"The combination of wide scholarship, balanced judgment and literary sensitivity that is so evident in it, makes Dr. Myles Dillon's *Early Irish Literature* an indispensable work for those who want to know about a remarkable and neglected chapter in the history of European culture."

## EARLY IRISH LITERATURE

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SONGS AND LEGENDS  
OF ANCIENT IRELAND

BY MYLES DILLON

Selecting the best Gaelic poems and legends, translating some of them for the first time, and weaving them together with the story of their development and historical setting, Mr. Dillon introduces the modern reader to this great heritage from the Irish past. \$3.50

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

## THREE GREEK TRAGEDIES IN TRANSLATION

By DAVID GRENE, *Department of Greek, the University of Chicago*

AESCHYLUS:

**Prometheus Bound**

"It suggests better than any other modern translations . . . the blunt, terse eloquence of the Greek verse. . . . The great situations of Greek tragedy retain their dramatic power in these translations."—*The Commonwealth*.

SOPHOCLES:

**Oedipus the King**

"The introductory essays . . . present in convincing fashion some new viewpoints in critical interpretation of the plays."—*The Virginia Quarterly Review*.

EURIPIDES:

**Hippolytus**

"The translator's introductions are full and instructive. He has dealt skillfully with the difficult problem of rendering the Greek into an English form which preserves the dignity and simple formalism of the original without pomposity."—*The Christian Century*.

\$2.50

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

